

percent. We believe that the wartime meat-management program, which was adopted by the National Livestock and Meat Council, of which I am a member, must be put into effect. The War Meat Board, which was set up at our suggestion, must have authority to function. I am sure that the entire livestock industry is in complete accord with this program. There are other gentlemen here today who have discussed the wartime meat-management program, and the War Meat Board and I will not encroach on their subject except to say that we believe that this is the only workable program that has been proposed, and it must be allowed to function in order to prevent chaos in the livestock industry.

The lamb feeders of this country face the same hazards of disease to our flocks, the hazard of unfavorable weather, and the hazard of continually increasing labor costs which have more than doubled in the past 2 years. We know that these same conditions prevail with the producers of feeder lambs and in the purchasing of the feeder lamb crop from producers, we believe that they are entitled to a price for their product that will insure them the return of their cost of operation plus a reasonable profit and likewise as lamb feeders we feel that we are entitled to the same consideration. We are unalterably opposed to experiencing the fallacies of regulation and direction from Washington and we know that any subsidy would simply mean more of the same thing. We believe that Government subsidy and dictation of any branch of private enterprise will mean ultimate strangulation of that industry leading eventually to complete state socialism in this country. We feel that there is much less need for a consumer's food subsidy in this country today than ever before in our history. The income of the wage earners of this country has risen much faster than the cost of food, resulting in idle dollars in the pockets of the people which are contributing to inflation and encouraging black markets in many commodities.

Feeders of cattle, hogs, and lambs will remember that day last May when the famous hold-the-line order which made headlines in the newspapers and on the radio and also they will remember the famous consumer subsidy and roll-back order on meat made into law by Executive order without the will or intent of Congress and they have a better memory of the fact that prices on live fat animals declined around 10 percent in price and have never recovered from that decline. I am asking, Who paid the bill? Wholesale and retail prices were lowered by that order.

Certainly we have a right to ask and demand that ceiling prices on meat carcasses both wholesale and retail be restored to the original ceilings which were in effect prior to the roll-back order.

You cannot encourage increased production of food unless you permit the food producers of this country to obtain a price for their product which will return that cost of production to them plus a fair margin of profit as a further incentive to bring about that maximum production. If our lamb-feeding operations should result in profits, we pay our just share of the income taxes due from these profits and we buy liberally of war bonds in order to carry on the war effort, but we feel that the money we invest in war bonds and that we pay in income taxes should be spent by the Federal Government as nearly as possible to carry on the war effort without being paid out in a subsidy to any group of citizens who do not need and are less entitled to a subsidy than at any time in the history of our country. But you cannot ask us to risk our capital in a lamb-feeding venture (without even the hope of returning that capital to us without loss) in order to produce the meat that this Nation so badly needs. The lamb-feeding industry is just as highly

specialized as any other industry in the country. It requires especially designed facilities and equipment. It requires men of experience to carry on these operations. We do not believe that there is a bureaucrat in Washington who knows half as much about our industry as the average man who spends his time in the feed yards and on the farms in this country.

I want to make it plain right here that there is no such thing as a cost of production. An explanation of that statement is in order. If it were possible to secure all of the data from every feed yard in the country it might be possible to arrive at a figure which would represent the average cost of production for a given season, but those same figures would not apply for the following season because of the change in weather and labor and feed costs and death loss and other hazards. It is impossible for the feed lot operators of the country to produce lamb as cheap as it is produced when lambs are grazed in the wheatfields of Kansas and the Southwest, when nature is kind enough to provide the wheatfields with ample growth. It might be possible, under ideal conditions, to produce gains on lambs on the Kansas wheatfields as low as 8 or 10 cents per pound of gain, depending, of course, upon the value placed on the growing wheat and the fortunes of weather and other unpredictable conditions, while in certain feed lots of the country the cost of gain per pound on lamb may run as high as 25 cents per pound in extreme cases. Now, if ceilings are placed on the finished products with the intention of reflecting the average cost of production, it is easy to see that high-cost producers are forced out of the market. Our arithmetic will prove that, if the average cost is used, approximately 50 percent of the producers will have a cost which is higher than that average. Consequently, these higher-cost producers must cease to operate. Understand this, that we are very happy to cooperate in any sound methods to curb uncontrolled inflation. Our industry has gone along a good many years risking our capital, taking both gains and losses as conditions developed, at the same time we have supplied the consumers of this Nation with lamb and mutton at prices they could afford and were willing to pay. You can rest assured that there will be no inflation, either in the pockets of the sheep producers or the lamb feeders of America under the present program and at the same time you can rest assured there will be continued liquidation of western breeding herds and materially reduced lamb-feeding operations this coming season, and with it a continuing reduction in the meat supply. I want to close by quoting from Thomas Jefferson, who once said: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread," and the same thing applies to meat.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our refuge and strength in times of trouble, grant that in these trying and tragic days we may be inspired with a greater faith in the moral order of the universe, a greater faith in the power of righteousness, and above all a greater faith in Thee.

We are confident that our beloved country will never go down in defeat or lose its national identity, if, as citizens of this great Republic and leaders in the affairs of church and state, we continue to turn our minds and hearts toward Thee and toward that which is true and just and right.

We pray that as a Nation we may be delivered from all enemies which assail us from within as well as without. Deliver us from those immoralities and those evils of crime and graft and corruption which are a blight upon our national character and a disgrace to our body politic.

May our domestic and foreign policies be Christian policies. Guard us against all hasty, intemperate, and ill-considered words and actions. May the spirit of unity prevail in all the various fields of national and international endeavor as we strive for peace on earth.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 322), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SCHWABE reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY AND INSURANCE ACTS OF 1921

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to call up a conference report on the theory that it is not going to take much time, not more than 10 minutes. If there is any roll call we will abandon the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. With that consideration, Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 319)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PART I—SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY

"SEC. 1. This part may be cited as the 'Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951'.

"SEC. 2. Except as hereinafter provided, on and after June 27, 1950, any person in the active service of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including the National Guard when called or ordered to active duty or active training duty for fourteen days or more; cadets and midshipmen at the United States Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies; commissioned officers of the Public Health Service while entitled to full military benefits as provided in section 212 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 689), as amended (42 U. S. C. 213); and commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey while assigned to duty during a period of war or an emergency as proclaimed by the President or the Congress on projects for the Army, Navy, or Air Force in areas outside the continental United States or in Alaska or in coastal areas of the United States determined by the Department of Defense to be of immediate military hazard, shall be automatically insured by the United States, without cost to such person, against death in such service in the principal amount of \$10,000: *Provided*, That any person called to extended active service for a period exceeding thirty days shall continue to be so protected for a period of one hundred and twenty days after separation or release from such active service: *Provided further*, That persons in the Reserve components, including the National Guard, while engaged in aerial flights in Government owned or leased aircraft for any period, with or without pay, as an incident to their military or naval training, shall be deemed to be in the active service for the purposes of this Act: *And provided further*, That for the purposes of this part, any person, who, on or after June 27, 1950, was or shall be provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance or for entry upon active duty in the military or naval service and who died or shall die as the result of disability incurred while en route to such place and within one hundred and twenty days after the incurrence of such disability, or any registrant under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, who on or after June 27, 1950, in response to an order to report for induction into the Armed Forces and who, after reporting to a local draft board, died or dies as the result of disability incurred while en route from such draft board to a designated induction station and within one hundred and twenty days after the incurrence of such disability shall be deemed to have died in active service.

"SEC. 3. Upon certification by the Secretary of the service department concerned of the death of any person deemed to have been automatically insured under this part, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause the indemnity to be paid as provided in section 4 only to the surviving spouse, child or children (including a stepchild, adopted child, or an illegitimate child if the latter was designated as beneficiary by the insured), parent (including a stepparent, parent by adoption, or person who stood in loco parentis to the insured at any time prior to entry into the active service for a period of not less than one year), brother, or sister of the insured, including those of the half-blood and those through adoption. The insured shall have the right to designate the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the indemnity within the classes herein provided; to designate the proportion of the principal amount to be paid to each; and to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries without the consent thereof but only within the classes herein provided. If the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries do not survive the insured, or if none has been designated, the Administrator shall make payment of the indemnity to the first eligible class of beneficiaries according to the order set forth above, and in equal shares if the class is composed of more than one person. Unless designated otherwise by the insured, the term "parent" shall include only the mother and father who last bore that relationship to the insured.

"Any installments of an indemnity not paid to a beneficiary during such beneficiary's lifetime shall be paid to the named contingent beneficiary, if any; otherwise, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted class next entitled to priority: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made to the estate of any deceased person.

"SEC. 4. The indemnity shall be payable in equal monthly installments of one hundred and twenty in number with interest at the rate of 2½ per centum per annum.

"SEC. 5. The automatic indemnity coverage authorized by section 2 shall apply to any person in the active service of the named Armed Forces who, upon death in such active service, or within one hundred and twenty days after separation or release from such active service as prescribed in section 2, is insured against such death under a contract of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, but only with respect to a principal amount of indemnity equal to the difference between the amount of insurance in force at the time of death and \$10,000. Any person in active service, who is insured under a permanent plan of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, may elect to surrender such contract for its cash value. In any such case the person, upon application in writing made within one hundred and twenty days after separation from active service, may be granted, without medical examination, permanent plan insurance on the same plan not in excess of the amount surrendered for cash, or may reinstate such surrendered insurance upon payment of the required reserve and the premium for the current month. Any person in the active service having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the five-year level premium term plan, the term of which expires while such person is in active service after the date of this enactment, shall, upon application made within one hundred and twenty days after separation from service, payment of premiums and evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the five-year level premium term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age. Waiver of premiums under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, shall not be denied in any case of issue or reinstatement of insurance on a permanent plan under this section in which it is shown to the satisfaction of the Administrator that total disability of the applicant commenced prior to the date of his application.

"SEC. 6. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this part, as are necessary or appropriate to carry out its purposes.

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part, to be known as the servicemen's indemnity appropriation, for the payment of liabilities under this part.

"SEC. 8. Any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion, or who, because of conscientious objections refuses to perform services in the land or naval forces of the United States or refuses to wear the uniform of such force, shall forfeit all rights to an indemnity under this Act: *Provided*, That re-rotation to active duty after commission of any such offense shall restore all rights to an indemnity under this Act. No indemnity shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment for crime or for military or naval offense, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States.

"SEC. 9. The provisions of Public Law Numbered 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), as amended, titles II and III of Public Law Numbered 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2031), as amended, and section 15 of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, insofar as they are applicable, shall apply to the provisions of this part: *Provided*, That assignments of all or any part of the beneficiary's interest may be made by a beneficiary to any other person or persons within the permitted class of beneficiaries, as specified in section 3, if all other persons having contingent rights of equal or greater priority to those of the assignee join in the assignment: *Provided further*, That such assignment shall not affect any payments made prior to its receipt by the Veterans' Administration.

"PART II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE AND NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

"SEC. 10. The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new sections:

"SEC 619. On and after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1951, except as otherwise provided in section 12 thereof, section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, and sections 620 and 621 hereof, no National Service life insurance or United States Government life insurance shall be granted to any person under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, nor shall any United States Government life insurance or National Service life insurance, on which the United States is authorized by law to pay the premium, be issued or granted to any person under any provision of law, nor shall the United States pay premiums on insurance issued prior to this enactment under the provisions of Public Law Numbered 289, Seventy-seventh Congress, November 5, 1941, Public Law Numbered 571, Seventy-seventh Congress, June 5, 1942, Public Law Numbered 658, Seventy-seventh Congress, July 8, 1942, Public Law Numbered 698, Seventy-seventh Congress, August 4, 1942, Public Law Numbered 729, Seventy-ninth Congress, August 13, 1946, or any other law for any period subsequent to the end of the second calendar month following the date of this enactment: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not be construed to prohibit the granting or issuing of National Service life insurance or United States Government life insurance in cases in which acceptable applications accompanied by proper and valid remittances or authorizations for the payment of premiums have, on or before



the date of approval of this amendatory act, been received by the Veterans' Administration, or which have, on or before said date, been placed in the mails properly directed to the Veterans' Administration, or been delivered to an authorized representative of any of the uniformed services.

"Sec. 620. Any person who is released from active service under other than dishonorable conditions on or after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1951, and is found by the Administrator to be suffering from a disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 per centum or more in degree and except for which such person would be insurable according to the standards established by the Administrator for qualifying under the good health provisions of this Act, as amended, shall, upon application in writing made within one year from the date service connection of such disability is determined by the Veterans' Administration and payment of premiums as provided in this Act, as amended, be granted insurance by the United States against the death of such person occurring while such insurance is in force: *Provided*, That insurance granted under this section shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in the standard policies of national service life insurance except (1) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 2¼ per centum per annum; (2) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values shall be based upon the Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 2¼ per centum per annum; (3) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949, and interest at the rate of 2¼ per centum per annum; (4) insurance granted under the provisions of this section shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited directly to a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States, and any payments on such insurance shall be made directly from such fund. Appropriations to such fund are hereby authorized. Except as herein provided, the provisions of this Act other than those contained in section 621 shall be for application to such insurance: *Provided*, That as to insurance issued under this section waiver of premiums, pursuant to section 602 (n) shall not be denied on the ground that the service-connected disability became total prior to the effective date of such insurance. All persons granted indemnity protection under section 2 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 shall be deemed to be in the active service for the purpose of applying for insurance under this section: *Provided*, That as to persons incurring disability under the conditions stated in the last proviso of section 2 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, application for insurance must be filed within one year after the incurrence of such disability.

"Sec. 621. (a) Any person entitled to indemnity protection under section 2 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 who is ordered into active service for a period exceeding thirty days, shall, upon application in writing made within one hundred and twenty days after separation from such active service and payment of premiums as hereinafter provided, and without medical examination, be granted insurance by the United States against the death of such person occurring while such insurance is in force. Insurance granted under this section shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in the standard policies of national service life insurance on the five-year level premium term plan except (1) all such insurance may be renewed for successive five-year term periods at the

attained ages, but may not be exchanged for or converted to insurance on any other plan; (2) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 2¼ per centum per annum; (3) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949, and interest at the rate of 2¼ per centum per annum; (4) insurance issued hereunder shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited to a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States and the payments on such term insurance shall be made directly from such fund. Appropriations to such fund are hereby authorized.

"(b) The Administrator is authorized to invest in, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell and retire, special interest bearing obligations of the United States for the account of the revolving fund with a maturity date as may be agreed upon by the Administrator and Secretary: *Provided*, That the rate of interest on such obligations shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury at a rate not exceeding the average interest rate on all marketable obligations of the United States Treasury outstanding as of the end of the month preceding the date of issue of this special obligation.

"Sec. 622. After the date of enactment of this section, any person while in active service for a continuous period in excess of thirty days who is insured under national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance shall be entitled, upon written application, to a waiver of all premiums on five-year level premium term insurance and that portion of any permanent insurance premiums representing the cost of the pure insurance risk, as determined by the Administrator, becoming due after the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this section, or the first day of the second calendar month following entry into active service, whichever is the later date, and during the remainder of such continuous active service and one hundred and twenty days thereafter: *Provided*, That no premium shall be waived under this section for any period prior to the date of application therefor: *Provided*, That if the term of any five-year level premium term insurance on which premiums have been waived under this section expires while the insured is in active service, such term shall be automatically renewed for an additional five-year period and the premiums due at the then attained age shall be waived as provided above: *Provided further*, That the election by an insured of the premium waiver benefits of this section shall thereby render his contract of insurance non-participating during the period such premium waiver is in effect: *Provided further*, That whenever benefits under such insurance become payable because of the maturity of such policy of insurance while the insured is in active service or within 120 days thereafter, liability for payment of such benefits shall be borne by the United States in an amount which, when added to any reserve of the policy at the time of maturity, will equal the then value of such benefits under such policy. Where life contingencies are involved in the calculation of the value of such benefits, the calculation of such liability or liabilities shall be based upon such mortality table or tables as the Administrator may prescribe with interest at the rate of 2¼ per centum per annum as to insurance issued under sections 620 and 621, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum as to other national service life insurance, and 3½ per centum per annum as to United States Government life insurance. The Administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from time to time from the national service life insurance appropriation to the National

Service Life Insurance Fund and from the military and naval insurance appropriation to the United States Government Life Insurance Fund such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"Sec. 11. The first sentence of section 602 (m) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) In any case in which the insured provided for the payment of premiums on his insurance by authorizing in writing the deduction of premiums from his service pay, such insurance shall be deemed not to have lapsed or not to have been forfeited because of desertion under section 612, so long as he remained in active service prior to the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, notwithstanding the fact that deduction of premiums was discontinued because—

"(A) the insured was discharged to accept a commission; or

"(B) the insured was absent without leave, if restored to active duty; or

"(C) the insured was sentenced by court martial, if he was restored to active duty, required to engage in combat, or killed in combat."

"Sec. 12. Nothing contained in part I or part II of this Act shall be construed to cancel or restrict any rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of this enactment.

"Sec. 13. This part may be cited as the 'Insurance Act of 1951.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. E. RANKIN,  
A. LEONARD ALLEN,  
OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
CARL ELLIOTT,  
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,  
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

WALTER F. GEORGE,  
TOM CONNALLY,  
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,  
E. D. MILLIKIN,  
ROBERT A. TAFT,  
HUGH BUTLER,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The managers on the part of the House in the conference on H. R. 1 (to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes), faced a most difficult problem in resolving the differences between the two Houses.

H. R. 1, as passed by the House by a unanimous roll call vote of 390 to 0 on January 24, 1951, provided, in substance, for a gratuitous indemnity in the amount of \$10,000 to be paid to the beneficiaries (largely the immediate families) of any person in the Armed Forces who died on or after June 27, 1950. This protection was continued for 90 days after discharge on a free basis and provision was also made for a post-service insurance for those men who were unable to obtain insurance at standard commercial rates because of service-connected disabilities. No provision was made for insurance after service for those persons discharged without disability.

After hearings on the House bill, the Senate Committee on Finance on February 14, 1951, reported H. R. 1 in substantially the same form as passed by the House with certain technical changes and providing for 120 days of free coverage after discharge in lieu of the 90 days provided for in the House-approved bill. When the Senate considered the proposal on the floor on February 26, 1951, an amendment was adopted which struck out all after the enacting clause of the bill as passed by the House and reported by the Senate committee and inserted in lieu thereof a provision which proposed free coverage of national service life insurance in the amount of \$10,000 from June 27, 1950, forward and to 120 days after the passage of the bill. All of the existing provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act would have been left undisturbed. A person dying in service after the one hundred and twentieth day and who had not taken out insurance would have no insurance or indemnity coverage of any kind, and a man suffering a disability who had neglected to take out insurance would thereafter be unable to secure any insurance even though his disability were service-connected.

Thus, it can be seen that the conferees had presented to them two diametrically opposed points of view, two entirely different legislative proposals. Under these conditions, the managers on the part of the House believe that the compromise version which is presented herewith is as reasonable a proposal as should be expected. While the House managers are convinced of the wisdom of the bill as approved by the House, the managers do recommend the adoption of the conference report. In essence, the bill agreed upon by the conferees contains substantially all of the provisions included in H. R. 1 as passed by the House, but with coverage for 120 days after discharge without cost to the serviceman and with certain technical amendments adopted from the Senate-reported version which are believed to be desirable or at least do not detract from the fundamental premises of the act. In addition, there has been included a provision that within 120 days after discharge, any veteran may obtain national service life insurance, but only on the 5-year level premium renewable term plan, and on a non-participating basis, with premiums being based upon the Commissioners' 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality with interest at 2½ percent per annum. The net result is to provide a man aged 20 with insurance at 21 cents per thousand as against 64 cents per thousand paid by World War I and II veterans at the same age. (See end of this statement on comparison of premium rates.) The difference between the premium rates will be substantially equivalent to the dividends payable on insurance issued for the higher premiums under existing law. The veteran will thus get protection at a rate comparable to the present rate. It will give him the opportunity to get the maximum of protection with a minimum of cost.

#### ANALYSIS OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

Section 1 provides that part I may be cited as the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

Section 2 provides that on and after June 27, 1950, except as otherwise provided, any person in the active service of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including the National Guard under the conditions hereinafter noted, shall be automatically insured, without cost to the person, against death in active service in the amount of \$10,000. Also included in this coverage are cadets and midshipmen of the United States Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies, and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey while engaged in specified types of duty. In addition, servicemen called for active service for a period exceeding 30 days will be

covered after separation from the service for a period of 120 days. This additional protection would not be available to a man who spends a few days each month in active-duty training as a part of some local Reserve unit.

The indemnity would be extended, as of June 27, 1950, to persons, including volunteers for enlistment and reservists called to active duty, who were or shall be provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance or for entry upon active duty and who died or shall die as the result of disability incurred while en route to such place and within 120 days after such incurrence. Similar coverage is extended to selectees who, in response to an order to report for induction and after reporting to a local draft board, died or dies as the result of disability incurred while en route from such draft board to a designated induction station and within 120 days after incurrence. In all such cases, the death shall be deemed to have occurred in active service for the purposes of part I.

Section 3 directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay the indemnity, upon certification of the death by the Secretary of the service department concerned, to the surviving spouse, child or children, parent, brother or sister. Unless designated otherwise, the term "parent" would include only the mother and father who last bore that relationship, to the insured. This, it will be seen, limits the beneficiaries to the survivors in the immediate family of the insured. Beneficiaries within these classes may be named by the insured. If the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries do not survive the insured, or if none has been designated, the indemnity is payable to the first eligible class of beneficiaries according to the order set forth above, and in equal shares if the class is composed of more than one person. Any installments not paid to a beneficiary during such beneficiary's lifetime are payable to the named contingent beneficiary, if any; otherwise, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted class next entitled to priority. No payments may be made to the estate of any deceased person.

Section 4. The indemnity is payable in equal monthly installments of 120 in number, with interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum. The conferees are advised that this will amount to \$92.90 per month for a 10-year period in cases in which the maximum indemnity is payable.

Section 5 limits the total liability of the Government to \$10,000 in any case where an indemnified person also has Government insurance in force. Thus, if a man in the service had \$5,000 of national service life insurance in force at the time of his death on or after June 27, 1950, the beneficiary would receive \$5,000 national service life insurance and \$5,000 gratuitous indemnity.

Provision is made that any person in the active service who has national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance on a permanent plan in force may surrender such policy and receive its cash surrender value. Within 120 days after separation from active service, and without medical examination, he may upon written application be granted permanent-type insurance on the same plan but not in excess of the amount surrendered, or he may reinstate such surrendered insurance upon payment of the required reserve and the premium for the current month.

While no rights of reinstatement under existing contracts of insurance will be impaired or denied by reason of enactment of the bill, the National Service Life Insurance Act and regulations issued thereunder provide presently that insurance surrendered for cash may not be reinstated nor may the person in such case be granted new insurance in any amount in excess of the difference between the amount of insurance surrendered and \$10,000. Accordingly, section 5 is de-

signed, among other things, to preserve the right of those who surrender their policy for cash to continue their insurance upon separation from service and to be eligible for full indemnity benefits while in service.

Rights under existing 5-year level-premium term insurance policies of reinstatement, conversion, or renewal are likewise not impaired by the provisions of the bill. However, in certain instances, the 5-year-term period will expire while insureds are in the active service and under conditions which would make it difficult or impossible for them to reinstate, renew, or convert their insurance prior to the expiration of the term. In order to preserve the rights of policyholders in such cases who have not applied for waiver of premiums authorized under section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, provision is made that any person in the active service having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan, the term of which expires while such person is in active service after the date of its enactment, shall, upon application made within 120 days after separation from service, payment of premium and evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age.

Section 6 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of part I. He presently has such authority under the National Service Life Insurance Act with reference to the amendments of that act proposed under part II of the bill.

Section 7 authorizes appropriations for the payment of liabilities under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

Section 8 provides that any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion, or who, because of conscientious objections, refuses to perform service in the land or naval forces of the United States, shall forfeit all rights to an indemnity under the act; also, that no benefit shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States. However, the section contains a proviso which makes it clear that restoration to active duty after commission of any such offense shall restore all rights to an indemnity.

Section 9 makes applicable to part I the provisions of Public Laws 262 and 844 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, and section 15, Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, which, among other things, would exempt the indemnity from taxation and claims of creditors; provide for the payment of benefits to minors and incompetents, with or without guardians; regulate the recognition and fees of attorneys and agents; and provide penalties for fraud. Provision is also made in this section that all or any part of the beneficiary's interest may be assigned to any person in the permitted classes when all other such persons having contingent rights of equal or greater priority join in the assignment.

#### Part II—Insurance Act of 1951

Section 10 adds four new sections, sections 619, 620, 621, and 622, to the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 619 limits the issuance of United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance to any person after its enactment except as provided in sections 5 and 10 of the bill. In addition, it is provided that the Government, after the end of the second calendar month following the date of enactment, shall no longer pay the premiums on any policies under the acts specified in this section. It was felt desirable that a specific provision be made that no further



premiums on insurance be paid by the Government, inasmuch as all persons within the purview of these acts will be covered by the automatic free indemnity. They will, of course, have the privilege of continuing such insurance by the payment of premiums, if they desire.

Section 620 provides for the issuance of insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of so-called "H" insurance (health insurance) to those men who, by reason of service-connected disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, would be uninsurable according to standards established by the Administrator. It is further provided in this section that application for such insurance must be made within one year from the date the service connection is determined to exist by the Veterans' Administration. This, it will be seen, is a very liberal provision for any service-connected disabled veteran to obtain insurance. The insurance issued, in accordance with prevailing practice, would be of a nonparticipating character. In addition, those individuals who are disabled on their way to report for induction or for active military duty will be entitled to the same sort of insurance. The authorization for a new table of mortality will result in substantially lower premium rates, thus providing additional benefits to disabled veterans concerned.

Section 621 provides the basis for new post-service insurance for which veterans in the future will be eligible to apply within 120 days from their discharge from service. As previously indicated, this insurance will be of a nonparticipating type and the premiums will be based on the Commissioners' 1941 Standard Table of Mortality, with interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum. Annuity settlements will be calculated on the annuity table for 1949, described in the November 1949 issue of Transactions, publication of the Society of Actuaries. It is prepared by William A. Jenkins and Edward A. Lew, both of whom are actuaries of recognized standing in the insurance field. (This article is reproduced on pages 2045 to 2109 in the hearings of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on related bills in the Eighty-first Congress.) Premiums and other collections shall be credited directly to a revolving fund in the Treasury with a provision for such appropriations as may be necessary. A comparison of the premium rates under such insurance with the rates for existing 5-year level term national service life insurance follows:

Monthly premium rate per \$1,000 based on Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table at 2½ percent, listing national service life insurance, and U. S. Government life insurance—Continued

#### 5-YEAR LEVEL PREMIUM TERM PLAN

Age at issue	Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table	National service life insurance (World War II)	U. S. Government life (World War I)
18.....	\$0.20	\$0.64	\$0.64
19.....	.21	.65	.64
20.....	.21	.65	.65
21.....	.22	.65	.65
22.....	.23	.66	.66
23.....	.24	.66	.66
24.....	.25	.67	.67
25.....	.26	.67	.67
26.....	.27	.68	.68
27.....	.28	.69	.68
28.....	.29	.69	.69
29.....	.31	.70	.70
30.....	.32	.71	.71
31.....	.34	.72	.72
32.....	.36	.73	.73
33.....	.38	.74	.74
34.....	.40	.75	.75
35.....	.43	.76	.76
36.....	.45	.77	.77
37.....	.48	.79	.79
38.....	.51	.81	.80

Monthly premium rate per \$1,000 based on Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table at 2½ percent, listing national service life insurance, and U. S. Government life insurance—Continued

Age at issue	Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table	National service life insurance (World War II)	U. S. Government life (World War I)
39.....	\$0.54	\$0.83	\$0.82
40.....	.58	.85	.84
41.....	.62	.87	.87
42.....	.67	.89	.89
43.....	.71	.92	.92
44.....	.76	.95	.95
45.....	.82	.99	.99
46.....	.88	1.03	1.03
47.....	.95	1.08	1.08
48.....	1.02	1.14	1.14
49.....	1.10	1.20	1.20
50.....	1.19	1.27	1.27
51.....	1.28	1.35	1.35
52.....	1.38	1.44	1.43
53.....	1.49	1.54	1.53
54.....	1.61	1.65	1.64
55.....	1.75	1.77	1.76
56.....	1.89	1.90	1.89
57.....	2.04	2.05	2.04
58.....	2.21	2.21	2.21
59.....	2.40	2.40	2.39
60.....	2.60	2.60	2.59
61.....	2.82	2.82	2.81
62.....	3.05	3.07	3.06
63.....	3.31	3.34	3.33
64.....	3.59	3.64	3.63
65.....	3.90	3.97	3.96
66.....	4.23	4.34	4.33
67.....	4.59	4.74	4.73
68.....	4.98	5.18	5.17
69.....	5.41	5.66	5.64
70.....	5.87	6.18	6.16

Section 11 incorporates the amendment offered by Senator Aiken of Vermont on the floor of the Senate which provides coverage for a limited group of World War II cases not eligible for benefits under section 602 (m) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, because of the forfeiture provisions contained in section 612 of said act, where the serviceman had authorized in writing a deduction from his pay for national service life insurance, and was subsequently court-martialed, thus forfeiting his rights to insurance. In certain cases, persons who deserted were later restored to active duty and killed in action believing that their insurance was in force. It is believed that restoration to active service should include restoration of rights to insurance. This provision is in line with section 8 of H. R. 1 and the managers are convinced that this is an equitable provision and therefore agreed to include it.

Section 12 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to cancel or restrict in any way any rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of its enactment. The committee has been advised that in the absence of this specific provision the language of the bill would not preclude renewal of term insurance if otherwise authorized, or future reinstatement or conversion of policies which have lapsed before or after the enactment of the bill. Should the question arise as a result of improper interpretation by any Government agency, it is the opinion of the committee that the courts would sustain the position that contract rights cannot be affected by subsequent legislation. In any event, section 11 will remove any doubt as to such matters.

Section 13 states that part II may be cited as the "Insurance Act of 1951."

J. E. RANKIN,  
A. LEONARD ALLEN,  
OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
CARL ELLIOTT,  
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,  
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the reasons back of the conference agreement on H. R. 1, the gratuitous indemnity bill, are set forth very clearly in the statement of the managers on the part of the House which has already been read.

I simply want to stress that the agreement is the most reasonable one which could be obtained under the circumstances. The House Members were faced with a diametrically opposed proposition in the Senate bill as passed by that body. As agreed upon in the conference, we have been able to obtain all of the provisions of H. R. 1 as passed by the House and get the automatic coverage after discharge extended from 90 to 120 days. In addition, provision is made that a veteran within a 120-day period after his separation from service, may take out a 5-year level premium term, nonparticipating insurance plan, at a greatly reduced premium rate. This will give him the maximum amount of protection at a minimum cost, and at the same time greatly reduce the administrative burden placed upon the Government.

Tremendous savings will result from the passage of this legislation, and at the same time uniform protection will at last be achieved for all members of the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House has accepted the conferees' report upon H. R. 1.

It is good legislation, and a much better bill than that we passed here on January 24. You may recall that I spoke at that time and expressed a hope that when the measure was considered in the Senate some way could be found to permit the veterans to purchase Government insurance after leaving the service. The bill we have just acted upon does that. Within 120 days after discharge—during which time the veteran is covered by the gratuitous indemnity—he may apply for, without medical examination, a term policy up to \$10,000. I know that this added feature of H. R. 1 will please many who have objected to the measure as it passed the House.

Another feature of the bill that pleases me, and in future days will lessen some of the burdens we face as Representatives, is the gratuitous-indemnity feature. Since World War I and World War II all of us have been confronted, time and again, with the problem caused by the soldier not applying for insurance, and later dying, leaving his dependents without insurance protection. Under this bill everybody is protected, and the widow and orphans of men dying in the service will receive \$92.90 a month over a 10-year period.

Another change in the bill as it first passed the House of Representatives is the provision that the term policies issued to those who desire them, after service, will be paid by a premium based upon the 1941 Commissioners' Standard

Ordinary Table of Mortality, with interest at 2¼ percent per annum. That means greatly reduced premiums, but no dividends will be payable. The savings in administrative expense because of this provision should be considerable.

I believe that the meeting of the House and Senate conferees was one of the finest and most cooperative that I have ever attended. The results show the unanimity of thought that prevailed.

#### 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Permit the Chair to state that section 1 of the committee substitute is now open for further amendment. Are there any further amendments to this section at the present time?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 28, after subsection (d) of section 1, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], I think it was, offered an amendment yesterday to the Barden substitute dealing with this subject matter. We have sought to put it in proper language so that this not only applies to men who are inducted but to anyone in the service; in other words, it carries out what the gentleman and what the committee expressed its opinion on to let every man in the armed services have the privilege of writing his Congressman or Senator on any subject if it does not violate the law or if it does not deal with some secret matter.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Probably we should have had a quorum call before we went into Committee. I take it that the gentleman recognizes that the gentleman from Wisconsin should have been

permitted to offer this amendment to the bill as it is presently before us. Now, I shall have word sent to him. But, if the gentleman insists on his amendment there is nothing I can do about it.

Mr. VINSON. I withdraw the amendment for the time being. I want to state this, the reason I am offering it is because I was afraid they would read section 2, and therefore he would be precluded from offering it, because the amendment is to section 1.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman's responsibility is as great as mine to have a quorum present, and I think probably that was expected generally by the membership. However, we were in the Committee before at least I recognized that we should have had a quorum call.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. It requires only 100 in Committee.

Mr. VINSON. I understand that, but I think some Members left the floor after the last count.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 29]

Allen, La.	Dingell	Shelley
Armstrong	Fallon	Sieminski
Barden	Frazier	Sittler
Bentsen	Gamble	Smith, Wis.
Boykin	Gillette	Whitten
Brehm	Kennedy	Widnall
Buchanan	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Celler	Murdock	Wood, Idaho
Crosser	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff
Davis, Tenn.	O'Konski	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 1, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 404 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 39, strike out lines 2 through 7, inclusive.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is technical in nature.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this statement: I am hoping that the Committee can finish the consideration of the bill and all amendments thereto at least by 5 o'clock this afternoon. That would probably provide time for ample debate on every amendment to be offered. If we can finish it by then we will be able to dispense with a meeting tomorrow, but if we do not finish the bill today the House leadership has asked me to state to the Committee that it will be necessary to have a session tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON: On page 52, following the word "duty", insert the following:

"(y) That, commencing on July 1, 1951, the procurement of military personnel for the Army, Navy, (including the Marine Corps) and the Air Force, shall be under the direction of the Director of Selective Service, whether the same be by induction or by enlistment.

"The Secretary of Defense shall, by regulations, promulgate the rules governing the manner in which enlistees shall be taken into the respective services and how inductees shall be distributed among the various services. Said regulations shall, as far as practicable, provide for a unification of effort in enlisting personnel for the various services."

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, what part of the bill are we now considering?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 1 of the pending bill, which consists of 52 pages.

Mr. HAVENNER. Amendments to that section will still be in order after the pending amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this amendment should be free from any heat. It should really be non-controversial.

As all of you know, we have a very large system of voluntary enlistment, in each of the services. The point I want to try to get you to understand is that if you will adopt this amendment, you will still get the recruits for the various branches of the service but you will get them at about 10 percent of the cost you are now paying under the enlistment system.

Up to January 31, 1951, that is, in 7 months of the present fiscal year, the Army and the Air Force, which have joint offices to enlist men, had spent \$30,231,000. For only 7 months they spent over \$30,000,000. The Navy had spent \$1,860,000, the Marine Corps \$1,135,000. All the services had spent an aggregate of a little over \$33,000,000 for seven-twelfths of a fiscal year. The costs for the whole year at that rate would exceed \$56,000,000 this fiscal year.

The cost of inducting men into the armed services during World War II by the Selective Service System was \$25 a person inducted. The cost of enlisting them during that same time was about \$250 per individual who was taken in as a recruit under the voluntary-enlistment system. If this amendment is adopted, and it is nothing but plain, common sense, every single office of the Selective Service System in every local district will be a place where a man may be enlisted



for whatever branch of the service he wishes to enter, under rules that will be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I appreciate that the gentleman's amendment does not affect the situation, but there have been a great deal of inquiries as to why, since the start of the Korean emergency or the Korean War, there has been an insistence on the part of the different branches of the service on 4-year enlistments, except for the Army, which insists that these enlistees go in for a period of 3 years. That would seem to be far in excess of what the ordinary emergency enlistment should be, even under war conditions and immediately following the war. Would the gentleman care to comment on that, as to why there has been this insistence on such a long enlistment period?

Mr. JOHNSON. The reason for that insistence is that we get more for the dollar, which is expended by the Government, if a man goes in for a longer period of time. When you take into consideration the cost per individual for traveling, leave, and so forth, the Government gets more for each dollar that is expended, where the enlistment is for 3 or more years, as we have the soldier for a longer time, after he has had his basic training. But the point of this amendment is that the Defense Department will prescribe the rules for enlistment. As long as we have a way to procure men, and an efficient service set up, where available men must be registered, why not get those who wish to enlist at this place. It is fair to every service, and provides a simple, efficient, and economical method for enlisting these men. It is obvious to anyone when it costs \$30,-231,000 for 7 months just for the Army and the Air Force that it is entirely too costly.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman's amendment make it possible to have recruitments, in one office, in the Selective Service office, and all the services would join in and be unified in that one office?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. And that would eliminate the competition between the different branches of the service?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, and it would cut out all the abuses that we have today because every single available man would go through that central agency.

Mr. STEFAN. How much would it cost?

Mr. JOHNSON. To induct men in World War I cost \$25 per individual, and to enlist a man during World War II cost \$250-plus.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman know how many men were recruited by the Army and the Air Force during that 7 months' period when \$30,000,000 was spent?

Mr. JOHNSON. I was unable to get that information specifically, but an article from the Daily News of today states the number as 13,398.

Mr. JUDD. It would be very interesting to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the cost is very high. We had testimony on that in the hearings. This is not a plan which I have thought up. This plan was tried in Grand Rapids, Mich., and that is how I learned of it and became interested in it. The people testified that it was very successful there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this, as I said, was tried in Grand Rapids. It proved to be a tremendous success. I can see no reason why any group, whether it be the Marine Corps or the Navy or any other group, should object to this sort of a scheme when they may have enlistment officers, if they wish, in the Selective Service offices. The duplication we now have considering the fact that we have a shortage of manpower is almost criminal, to say nothing of the cost. Almost 14,000 men are engaged in enlistment work. That amounts to nearly enough men for a division. They are men who could be engaged in direct military work.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman's amendment should be adopted, it would dispense with all voluntary enlistments, would it not?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, it would not.

Mr. ELSTON. Well, it would mean they have to go through Selective Service, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSON. It would mean that the Selective Service offices would be the place where they could be enlisted, and there would not have to be offices duplicating the same work.

Mr. ELSTON. But suppose that a boy wants to enlist in the Marine Corps, the Selective Service would be under no obligation to see that he was enlisted in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, yes; the Selective Service office would be under an obligation and orders to take the enlistment for the Marine Corps or the Navy or any other particular branch of the Service. There is no doubt about that. Under the provisions of my amendment, the Secretary of Defense would be obligated to issue such orders.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman point out just exactly what he is trying to accomplish by his amendment, and how it differs from the language of the present bill? I wish the gentleman would make that plain, because I do not

think it is clear exactly what the gentleman's amendment would accomplish.

Mr. JOHNSON. The language of the bill provides for the induction of the men, and where they register and are classified. Under my amendment the enlistment of the men which is now going on in Chicago and Milwaukee and all over the country, and which is being operated by the respective services, shall be combined with the Selective Service System and enlistments shall be according to rules prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, for the respective services.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is trying to consolidate the work of enlistment, is that what the gentleman's amendment is aimed at?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; I would consolidate the whole procurement of men by inducting and enlisting in one place and cut expenses down 90 percent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the House Chamber is equipped with microphones and Members are out of order who address the chair, so that other Members cannot hear.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no rule of the House requiring Members to use the microphones.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, let me ask this question. Suppose a boy's home is in Minneapolis and he happened to be working in Kansas City, and he decides to join the Marine Corps: Would he have to go back to Minneapolis to his local selective-service board, or could he enlist in Kansas City?

Mr. JOHNSON. No. He could walk right into the selective-service office in Kansas City and enlist there.

Mr. JUDD. He could enlist in any selective-service office?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. Of course, under the full-scale induction system enlistments were restricted, but a man could enlist. For instance, my own son enlisted in the Air Force after he registered for the draft.

Pursuant to leave granted me, I enclose the following article:

OUR WASTED MILITARY MANPOWER—FIFTEEN THOUSAND UNIFORMED PERSONNEL HOLD RECRUITING AND INFORMATION JOBS

(By Jim G. Lucas)

The armed services have more than 15,000 officers and enlisted men on recruiting and public-information jobs.

That's close to an infantry division. It's enough to man five big aircraft carriers or five B-36 groups. It's enough for 10 jet-fighter groups.

It would be erroneous to say there is no need for the services these men perform, but the numbers could be questioned.

Approximately 600 public-relations officers and men are serving overseas. Some have been killed in Korea. The Pentagon's daily briefing on the Korean War has been a real help. Without it you'd know much less about what's going on.

It would be physically impossible to report or interpret anything as big as the Defense Establishment—37 percent of the national budget last year—without competent relations men as contact points. They are able

to tell reporters where to go to get the desired information. Frequently they get it themselves and give it to the press.

#### ONE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINE OFFICERS AND MEN

Last year the Armed Forces spent \$8,400,000 on public information. They used 706 civilians and 1,789 officers and men. The Army had 600 public-information officers and enlisted men, and 362 civilians. The Navy, including the Marines, had 418 military and 58 civilians. The Air Force had 718 officers and men and 217 civilians. The Defense Department itself used 53 military public-information people and 71 civilians.

Of that number, 364 Army public information personnel were stationed outside the United States. The Navy had 63 abroad, the Air Force 157, and the Marine Corps 1.

#### CUT ROLLS SLIGHTLY

The military has been able to cut its public information rolls slightly. In the last 12 months it dismissed 142 civilians and transferred 69 officers and men.

Public relations is essential, but it can be argued that competent officers and men are holding jobs for which they were not intended, and which could be filled just as well by civilians. Take, for instance, the case of H. D. Schooley, head of the Defense Department's press section. Mr. Schooley took off a lieutenant commander's uniform to take the civilian job at approximately \$8,400 a year. But serving under him are three full colonels. Their take-home pay is considerably more than their civilian boss gets.

#### THANKLESS JOB

There is no doubt that most unformed public-relations men would prefer to be somewhere else. The job is a thankless one. If an officer is unfortunate enough to be assigned as a personal public-relations assistant to a temperamental civilian superior his career can be jeopardized by one unfortunate publicity break.

Much of the time they're torn between loyalty to their bosses and the people they serve—the press and the public. Many generals, admirals, and civilian officials expect their public-relations men to prevent publication of unfavorable items. When they can't they're in trouble. And often reporters are not satisfied with the answers they get, no matter how much work it has involved.

Most airmen on Pentagon public relations duty—Navy, Air Force, and marine—spend their free time pulling strings for a genuine flying assignment. That's their real love.

#### PARKS IS EXAMPLE

Nevertheless, all services have some of their best men at public-relations desks. Maj. Gen. Floyd Parks, the Army's Public Relations Chief, is generally credited with being one of the best in the business. He's so good he's probably stuck indefinitely in a job he doesn't particularly like.

General Parks is a former Berlin commandant, a fine administrator, and a top-flight soldier. He could command a division or a corps, and he would like nothing better.

Working opposite these men are former newspaper reporters and editors to whom it's just another job in their profession. Some people feel many more military public-relations posts could be filled by civilians, freeing competent line officers and enlisted men for other work.

#### RECRUITING PERSONNEL

Recruiting is another matter. During World War II it was suspended and all services got their manpower through the draft. The Navy, Marines, and Air Force don't like that system. The Army, on the other hand, contends that under recruiting the other services get all the best men first.

There can be no doubt, however, that the Defense Department could release thousands of good officers and enlisted men—now assigned to recruiting—for more essential jobs if it turned the task over to Selective Service. Currently Selective Service is operating with 229 officers and enlisted men borrowed from all services.

The three services have 13,398 on recruiting duty. Approximately 10 percent are officers. Of the Army-Air Force Recruiting Division's 9,446, approximately 250 are Wacs and Wafs. The Navy has 168 officers and 2,175 enlisted men, and the Marines 93 officers and 1,516 enlisted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has again expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KILDAY. Please permit me to make my statement first.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment transfers from the military service to the Selective Service System all power of recruitment. In addition to that, it provides that the Director of Selective Service may fix the manner, the plan, and the system by which they shall be enlisted or inducted. But, more important, it provides that the Director of Selective Service shall provide for the distribution of those taken into the service.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will yield, it does not provide that at all. The Secretary of Defense is the one who provides the rules and the distribution of the men. That is right in the amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. The amendment will speak for itself. As a practical proposition, when you transfer to the Director of Selective Service you know that his influence will be brought to bear with reference to that. I do not believe that the committee at this stage of the game would want to abolish or in any wise circumscribe the traditional right of Americans to volunteer for the service. Surely the great volunteer State of Tennessee would not agree to such an amendment. We happen to know the thinking of General Hershey along this line. He has advocated on many occasions since the expansion of the Armed Forces began that voluntary enlistments be suspended; that all persons be procured for all of the Armed Forces through the Selective Service System. Of course, the Marine Corps is proud of its traditional volunteer system. During the war, for a period, it is true, they had inductees, but on the other hand the Marine Corps is very proud of its position as an elite fighting corps of volunteers. This amendment could result in either the Secretary of Defense, who is an Army man, or the Director of Selective Service, deciding who shall go into the Marine Corps or into the Air Force. At this stage of the game I do not believe we want to deprive young Americans of the

traditional right to enlist and to select the service in which they desire to serve. I am sure the Marine Corps would not relish a provision of this kind, and I know that the Air Force would not. Quite frankly, we are faced with the necessity of providing men for the Army. Up until this time volunteer enlistments in the other services have been adequate, but at this time we find it necessary to procure men for the Army.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that just the other day the Secretary of Defense inaugurated a new program of qualitative distribution of military manpower that will eventually lead to unification of all recruiting activities, and thereby reduce the cost?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. It is just going into effect. It has not been tried yet. It is something that was discussed with the committee at great length, to insure the Army securing its proper proportion of the high I. Q. inductees.

Mr. JOHNSON. This does not stop anybody from enlisting. It does not take any rights away from enlistment.

Mr. KILDAY. I know it does not say so.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Secretary of Defense came out with this proposition because he knew that we were thinking about the scheme.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, no; the gentleman cannot sustain that because the question that the Secretary of Defense brought to us was discussed with us in the first day or two of the hearings almost 3 months ago, the question of the qualitative distribution of personnel.

I agree that the gentleman's amendment does not state that he shall abolish voluntary enlistment, but it does advocate a channeling of recruitment through the Selective Service System. We know what will happen under the powers granted by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I read the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, it adds nothing whatever to the authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to enlistments which the Secretary of Defense does not already have. He already has the authority to do the very things referred to in the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, the qualitative distribution comes under the powers possessed by the Secretary of Defense. It is in an impartial exercise of that power that he has issued the directive regarding qualitative assignment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What about his claim of some economy in changing the service?

Mr. KILDAY. It is true that recruitment costs money. On the other hand,



it is also true that we must maintain the pride of these services. It is true that we must have a channel for the dissemination of information with reference to the services. One of the great things in morale is the tradition and achievements of the particular service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. The distribution of information with reference to the pride of the various corps and the various branches of the service is well worth while in promoting the welfare of the services, the spirit and morale of the troops. We must sustain it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman from Texas has made a very significant point that all Members should bear in mind: Competition, I think, is just as healthy and necessary among our armed services in order to have efficiency as it is in business in order to have efficiency.

Mr. KILDAY. The man who enters the service and picks out one branch of the service because he thinks it is the best in the world makes a good soldier. He wants to think that his outfit is the best in the world, that his airplane is the best up in the skies, that his ship is the most efficient ship afloat.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. One other thought, if the gentleman from Texas will permit, is it not a fact that it would impose on Selective Service the necessity of spending additional money in order to carry out this program?

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, yes; it would cost money to set up any system to supersede that now in effect. But it has been my experience that the principal result of these reorganizations has been merely to change the name on the door of an office. That is what generally happens in these reorganizations and consolidations.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. I think the position which the gentleman from Texas takes is very sound. I think the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. In view of the fact that the Selective Service System is not intended to be continued as a permanent agency of the Government, if we should adopt the proposed amendment would it not be necessary that we later change or be required to revert to the present Army system of recruiting?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; that is right; you would have to establish the organization

which otherwise would be dealing with this now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the new rules which have been referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] can a man now go and voluntarily enlist under the new ruling and designate the service where he would like to serve and have any degree of certainty of serving in the service with this equalizing rule in effect?

Mr. KILDAY. It will depend upon what the quota happens to be at the moment that he seeks to enlist.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So, he can at least express his preference.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, yes. There is separate recruitment for the Navy and Marine Corps. The Army and Air Force recruit together, I am sure the gentleman understands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the ratio will permit, then he lands where he prefers.

Mr. KILDAY. He goes to the recruiting office of the service he desires to join, and if there is room he is accepted. If the quota is exhausted he gets his name on the list and enters when the new quota comes out if the draft board does not get him in the meantime.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Certainly the great State of Tennessee does not want to see anything done that will take away from her the reputation she has so proudly won. I think this amendment might do it.

Mr. KILDAY. At least it impinges on it. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The plan was first proposed to the Committee on Armed Services by a member of one of the draft boards in my own town, Grand Rapids, Mich., who came down here at his own expense and testified before the committee. As a result of the activity of the draft board members, I investigated the possibilities of this program a year and a half ago and at that time wrote the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, for some facts and figures as to the cost of the present recruiting program.

Here is a letter from Secretary Johnson, dated January 18, 1950, as to cost and I think you ought to listen to this very carefully:

For fiscal year 1948 the Army and Air Force spent over \$40,000,000 on recruiting activities in obtaining 281,171 enlistments or reenlistments. In the same fiscal year the Navy spent over \$10,000,000, a total of over \$50,000,000 for recruiting activities for the three branches of the service.

I know and you know that Selective Service could do the same job infinitely cheaper.

Again referring to the letter, for the fiscal year 1949 the Army and Air Force spent over \$40,000,000, the Navy spent over \$8,000,000, or almost \$50,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949.

The gentleman from California has told you that for the first 7 months of this past year the various branches of the service have spent over \$32,000,000.

Now, let us get this clear. The pending amendment in no way whatsoever deprives anybody of any right to enlist. It simply says that in your home town and in my home town instead of having four recruiting offices—one for the Army, one for the Navy, one for the Air Force, and one for the Marines, with men running all over your community trying to sell these boys at a terrifically high per capita cost, they can go down to one office and enlist.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, it would be a great saving of badly needed manpower if this amendment is adopted?

Mr. FORD. I wholeheartedly agree with the statement of the gentleman.

A recent article appearing in one of the Washington papers, the Washington News, pointed out that over 13,000 members of the Armed Forces are on recruiting duty throughout the United States. That is almost an Army division. These men could well be used overseas, in Korea and elsewhere. This is the most outrageous situation I think exists in the Armed Forces today.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman just stated some 13,000 of the armed services are detailed to recruiting. Does he not think that we would at least have to have a large increase for the selective service to do the work that those 13,000 are doing?

Mr. FORD. I respectfully suggest to the gentleman I am sure at least a 75-percent reduction in personnel could be achieved. I think the figures offered by the gentleman from California indicate that we could achieve the same success in recruiting personnel at 90 percent less cost.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. The figures quoted by the author of the amendment show that in 7 months the Army and Air Force spent \$30,000,000 and the Navy and Marine Corps spent \$3,000,000. Does the gentleman have any explanation as to this great discrepancy?

Mr. FORD. The figures I have for 1948 and 1949 show about the same ratio. I did not go beyond those figures.

Mr. MORTON. I think the gentleman was in the Navy; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. Absolutely correct.

Mr. MORTON. The gentleman knows that to get certain ratings were very difficult during wartime?

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. MORTON. Yet when we happened to get a little shore duty we found a recruiting office with a man with a good many hash marks in charge of that recruiting office. I assume that is going on today?

Mr. FORD. I think if anyone would go to their own local recruiting office they would find a rather sizable number of men assigned to such duty who have had vast experience in combat and sea duty. I think those men could do a little better job out in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON) there were—ayes 91, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Page 29, after line 16, add the following new subsection:

"(1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, 'That, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.'"

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, competition among the services is a fine thing, but the fact remains that the Army is not getting the men. The glamor of the Air Force, the glamor of the Navy, and the glamor of the Marine Corps does not tend to increase Army enlistments. The average American boy does not fall head over heels in love with the idea of being flung into the mud of Korea. I want to make it a little easier for the Army to get the men they need without drafting them.

There is another consideration. A good many American boys still take pride in volunteering for service. Many of them are just finishing high school. They want to go ahead and do their bit. They want to serve their time now and not later, but maybe they do not want to make a career of Army service; nor do they wish to be hooked for a long-time enlistment. What this amendment does is allow them to come up before they get their first notice of induction and say, "I join up of my own free will and accord to serve my country for the same period of time as I would be required to serve if I were called through selective service. I want to volunteer; I want to enlist for that period." It is just as simple as that.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. To get the subject matter of the gentleman's amendment clearly before the Committee, it simply means that a boy who is within the draft age, instead of waiting to be called, can volunteer and will serve whatever time the inductee would have to serve.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. I will state that, as far as the table is concerned on this side, we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to raise this question with the chairman of the committee. The other day I had an inquiry from a college student out in my district who is married. He has no children. He is liable for induction. He sought to enlist and was told that he could not enlist, that they would not take him for enlistment. They said he had to be inducted.

Mr. VINSON. That is what this covers.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it was the Air Force. Certainly, if there is to be a consistent policy, if a boy is liable for induction the mere fact that he is married should not preclude him from having the right to enlist.

Mr. VINSON. The Army adopted a policy not to take any married men. For that reason, they would not accept the case to which the gentleman refers. What the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina does is this. If the boy is 18½ years of age and liable for induction, instead of sitting around and waiting to be drafted he volunteers and is taken into the service. By doing so he serves 26 or 21 months, or whatever is agreed to as the length of service. That is all the amendment accomplishes.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to be very sure that the will of Congress is understood in this thing, because this provision is the law now and is generally disregarded. The Army is not paying any attention to it. I want the Army to know what the Congress of the United States expects of it if this provision is included in the law.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that some 4,700 people were enlisted under the present statute along this line, but when it is written in now I feel confident that the armed services will follow it.

Mr. RICHARDS. From January 1949 to August 1950 not one single person was accepted for enlistment under the conditions of this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct that they were not taking those enlistments. The reason given to us, and

whether it is the whole reason or not I do not know, was that there was a fear that the boy enlisting would enlist under a misapprehension. In other words, we have heretofore extended existing enlistments, and this bill continues the power to extend existing enlistments. However, the provision the gentleman has included in his amendment is that enlistments of this category shall not be extended except in the event of emergency or war declared by Congress. The reason stated to us is eliminated, so there should be no reason why the boy should not enlist. I think the gentleman's amendment is in order.

Mr. RICHARDS. My amendment corrects that situation, and the boy who enlists under this provision may serve only as long as a draftee will serve. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Why does not the gentleman make his amendment apply to cover other branches of the service? In other words, if it is to be applicable to the Army, why should it not be applicable to the other branches?

Mr. RICHARDS. The other branches are getting the men anyway. They do not have a bit of trouble getting them.

Mr. HALLECK. What the gentleman essentially is trying to do is to make it possible for the boy to enlist in the service on the same terms as he would come in if he were inducted. If that is a good principle, then why should it not be applicable to all of the branches of the service? Personally I think it is a good principle, and I am impressed with the gentleman's amendment. Particularly am I impressed with that feature of it which will say to these boys as they go into the service, "Unless we are in a war or in an emergency declared by the Congress, we have a contract with you as to the time you are to serve and we propose to live up to that contract."

Mr. RICHARDS. Theoretically speaking the gentleman is probably correct, but I want to make it so that men will volunteer to join in the Army. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. REDDEN. I was just going to raise the same point which the gentleman from Indiana raised and to say that in my judgment it should apply to all the branches of the service. And this is my reason for making that statement. I called the Navy the other day about a boy who wanted to enlist. This boy who is 21 years old did not want to serve in the Army, but he wanted to go in the Navy. Their answer was that they would not take him unless he signed up for 4 years, and they did not want



him unless he wanted to make a career of it. I say that that attitude is wrong, and the suggestion made by the gentleman from Indiana ought to be followed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Notwithstanding what the gentleman says, the fact remains that there are plenty of boys who are willing to join up for a longer term in the other branches of the service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK to the amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Strike out the word "Army" and insert "armed services."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it will not take me very long to express what I have in mind because I gave you my views on this just a moment ago. I think as a matter of principle if a man wants to enlist in the armed services he ought to have the same right to enlist in any of the services and under the same conditions which would prevail if he were to be inducted into the service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. May I point out to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that the weakness of his amendment is that instead of helping the Army, it will channel all of this group right into the Navy and into the Air Force, because a boy will say, "I am 18½ years of age. I can enlist—I can go to my draft board and go in for 21 or 26 months. I will go into the Navy or go into the Air Force."

The original amendment is to help the Army and the substitute will build up where you do not want to build up and will destroy the benefit that we are trying to give to encourage men to go into the Army.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, if I understand the situation correctly the Air Force and the Navy and the Marine Corps are filling their quotas presently by enlistment. So far as I know they have not resorted to induction, is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. They are getting their quotas with 4-year enlistments.

Mr. HALLECK. If that is true, then certainly no man could be prejudiced any more than he is being prejudiced now because the processes of induction are not being used to put men into the services other than into the Army.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. The reason I am not willing to accept the gentleman's amendment is because I would be marching up the hill and marching right down again. The situation would be then just as it is now. The Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps will get all the men, and the situation will really be worse than it is now.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say that they are going to get all the men they want, as far as I can see, under the provisions of enlistment that are now prevailing. They have been getting them, so I can-

not see where it would make any difference.

Let me say further. I have regard to the man in my district who wanted to enlist in the Air Corps. They said, "We do not want you." It has already been suggested by members of the Armed Services Committee that, in spite of the law on the books, the procedures have not been carried out as they expected they would be carried out.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I thought the Air Force and the Navy needed men of longer enlistments because there were so many specialties, where a short period would not permit time for training. Therefore, that is another reason why there should very properly be a shorter period for voluntary enlistments in the Army.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. REDDEN. I think the interests of the young man as well as the interests of the country ought to be considered when passing on the branch of the service he will enter. In the first place, when we require him to serve a minimum of 26 months, as this law authorizes, we are then imposing upon him the longest period of military service in the history of the world. There is no country in the world that has required anything like this period of service. If he is to be required to serve 4 years to get in any branch aside from the Army, then you are extending him for double that service as a minimum in the Army, which already has a minimum of twice the service of any other country on earth. I say under the circumstances he ought to be allowed to make his choice.

Mr. HALLECK. I have an idea there are many weapons used in the Army that will require just as much technical training as any of the weapons used by the Navy.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. At the same time this amendment will have the result of going back to the quota system where, for instance, the Air Force gets more recruits than they can handle at one time. They will have to go back to where they were some time ago.

Mr. HALLECK. The Air Force does not have to take any more recruits than they can handle. They may have taken more than they need. The Air Force can certainly be in control of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to say a moment ago that it was the policy of the services to not take married men into the service?

Mr. VINSON. Just the Army, at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. That is true of the Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. That is not the policy of the Air Force or the Navy.

Mr. HARRIS. I understood the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to say that they turned his man down because he was a married man; they would not let him enlist in the Air Corps.

Mr. VINSON. That was in the Army. Mr. HARRIS. I understood he said it was the Air Corps.

Mr. HALLECK. I will have to verify that. I am not sure it was the Air Corps. My recollection may be in error. The chairman may be correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is adopted it would not do the Army any good, and would be a great disservice to the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps? They are now getting volunteers for 4 years, and under the amendment they would get them for only 26 months? The whole business of induction is unfair to the boys; there is nothing fair in war. But this amendment would hurt all the services and would not help any.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement I ask for a vote.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. What is provided by the amendment to the substitute is the very thing that you have been trying to do all the way through, give to the boys drafted into the service the right to choose whether they want to serve in the Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, or Army, insofar as it is practicable.

One of the things that has brought about more confusion than anything else is the fact that we have complicated the problem involved in the last 6 months by the breaking down of segregation and trying to do something in the Army and force it on the Army by strangling the Navy and Air Force. That process may be right, but I do not think so. Because I want to do something to straighten out the situation, I say accept the amendment.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi. As I said, I think in these days it may be that if we adopt this substitute amendment we will get more volunteers in the Army and we may be helping the Army, but I do not see how we can say to the young men of America that if you volunteer in

the Air Force or the Navy you have got to serve longer than if you volunteer in the Army. I think the young men of America should have the right to say what kind of service they prefer.

Mr. WINSTEAD. They should have a voice.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. If he is mentally and physically capable of serving he ought to have something to say about the branch of the service he enters.

Mr. WINSTEAD. And may I say further that if you leave the provisions of my amendment in this bill you will solve a lot of the problems that plague us at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman realize that what this really is is a refuge from the Army? Just as soon as we dropped selective service, enlistments in the Navy and Air Force went right down; but when we put selective service back in they jumped up again. They do not want to serve in the Army; they want to serve in the Navy and Air Corps.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes; that is the point I have been making. Keep the provisions of my amendment in the bill and the problem will be solved in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. We have a serious duty not only to these boys who are coming into the service but we also have a very serious duty to the United States of America. We cannot let the standards of the Army fall down below what they should be. We are involved here in Congress with that question, and I think we have got to be practical. We have got to insure to the Army men who are bright, alert, and capable of leadership if we are to maintain the Army that we ought to have.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I agree with what the gentleman says about maintaining the quality of the Army, but there is no common sense in penalizing the boys who enter the Air Force or the Navy because we have bungled in the case of the Army. We cannot curb every individual in America to satisfy that situation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER: On page 29, line 4, substitute a colon for the period and insert the following: "Provided, That no person inducted under the authority of this act shall be assigned to any theater of operation or to any area of combat of

which the commander shall not have full authority to bomb all transportation supply and air-force locations and facilities and all troop concentrations and movements which in the opinion of the commander of such theater or area serve or support the enemy."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, briefly, this amendment provides that in the future our military commanders must use every military means necessary in an effort to achieve victories in war. It means that they will no longer be hamstrung by the asinine policy that has been in force in Korea for many months.

In Korea, which has become known to our troops there as "Massacre Valley," many of the 10,000 boys who have been killed and the 50,000 boys who have been wounded have been victims of that policy which prevented our commanders from destroying enemy concentrations and other facilities.

Our failure to protect our troops in Korea has been disgraceful and this Congress should do something about it. This amendment will make it clear that we Members of Congress do not want to be parties to future needless casualties.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under the Atlantic Pact our soldiers may fight over in another theater of war under some commander other than an American and perhaps not under an American flag. Maybe we ought to offer an amendment to straighten that out, too.

Mr. SHAFER. I would think that would be a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we in this Congress must assume the responsibility if we permit such a policy of warfare to continue. I do not want to be blamed for bloodshed that can be prevented through the adoption of this amendment. I want our soldiers to have every possible chance for their lives.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Michigan has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Georgia has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane.

The Chair has examined the amendment with some degree of care and while it does present a very close question in the opinion of the Chair, yet it does appear to impose a limitation on the use of troops sought to be provided by the pending bill. In view of the fact that it does appear to be such a limitation, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 62, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be open to amendment at any point thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. That means the entire bill?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why should we not finish with section 1 in an orderly fashion before we move to another section?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman insists, that may be done. I am just submitting a request.

Mr. JUDD. It seems to me it would be better to take it up section by section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JUDD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Page 28, after subsection (d) of section 1, insert a new subsection as follows:

"No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment in effect as the one offered yesterday to the Barden substitute. That amendment was adopted. There is a difference in language, and that difference is attributable to the chairman of the committee who kindly rewrote it. I think, in its present form it is a better amendment, a more effective amendment, and I sincerely appreciate the assistance and cooperation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as far as the Members at the table on this side of the aisle are concerned, we have no objection to the amendment. We think it is a very important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 28, strike out lines 14 to 25 inclusive and on page 27, lines 1 through 16 inclusive; and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen or national of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years,



at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of 18 years and 6 months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be held to be applicable to any alien admitted for a temporary period (other than an alien exempt from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) who has remained in the United States for a period in excess of 1 year; any alien admitted for a temporary period who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President. But any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to impose upon aliens permanently residing in this country the same responsibility for the defense of this Republic as we are now placing on American citizens. It is necessary, because if you look at the bill you will find on page 27, line, 6 this language:

Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States—

And so forth. Well, that means just this, that in order to avoid military service an alien permanent resident need but fail to declare his intention to become a citizen of the United States. It is my considered opinion that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States should be made liable for training and service since they are being granted all the rights and privileges—except franchise—which are enjoyed by United States citizens. Under the law, they are permitted to remain in this country as long as they please, they are permitted to work, to acquire real property, and to produce children who, under the law, are native-born American citizens.

The alien permanent resident enjoys full constitutional protection.

It requires no stretch of the imagination to visualize a picture where the alien permanent resident, if exempt from military service, is permitted to enjoy security, livelihood, and civil rights in this country due to the fact that the United States citizen, drafted into the Armed Forces, protects his "guest" by fighting those who might place this alien permanent resident in jeopardy.

Extending the liability of military service only to those alien permanent residents who have filed their declaration of intention to become American citizens appears to be a halfway measure.

By doing so, the alien is permitted to choose the nature of his obligations toward his country of permanent residence. The filing of declaration of intention to become an American citizen is a subjective act, conditioned by the individual's particular state of mind. Since the law imposes such liability upon every American citizen, any exemption of permanent residents from such liability appears to be unjust and unfair.

During the last 2 years alone we have opened our doors to over 230,000 refugees. In that number there are a large number—around 12,000—of young men within the draft age who most definitely should repay to this country the debt they have incurred in accepting its hospitality, its protection, and its opportunities.

Many of them are in uniform already. Names of young displaced persons already appear on our casualty lists.

But, unfortunately, we occasionally hear of cases where some of these young immigrants refrain from taking out their first citizenship papers and apply for exemption from military service. Legislation has been introduced in Congress to deport such draft dodgers who apparently believe in the possibility of having their cake and eating it, too.

The very question of the purport of the term "residing" was passed on by the Supreme Court very recently in the case of McGrath against Kristensen. Kristensen was a Dane who was a visitor in the United States but was unable to return to Denmark because of the war. He registered for the draft and then claimed exemption from the provisions of the draft law on the ground that he was a citizen of a neutral country. He then married an American girl, and had children, I believe. He attempted to have his status adjusted from that of a deportable alien to that of a permanent resident, which the Attorney General refused to do. The case then went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court held that he was not ineligible to citizenship because under this very language he was not "residing" in this country and there was no obligation on his part to register, and if he claimed exemption, it was a meaningless thing.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that the amendment he has offered is what the committee had in mind. We have had the benefit of the Judiciary Committee staff and our staff in examining the amendment, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. How does the gentleman's amendment affect the qualification of aliens for commissions in the armed services?

Mr. WALTER. I do not think they would become eligible until they became citizens. The point of this is that they

would be required to register and serve just as native-born or naturalized American citizens are now required to register and to serve.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. That is the information I wanted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. It is high time that we did something about this situation.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if the gentleman has given his consideration, and I assume he has, to the effect his amendment will have upon the possibility of American nationals who are residing in some foreign country which may have a program of universal conscription being liable for the same sort of treatment in that foreign country as we impose upon foreign nationals in this country.

Mr. WALTER. No, because this applies only to immigrants, to aliens admitted for permanent residence, who have come to the United States for the purpose of ultimately becoming citizens. It would not apply to a student, or a visitor, or a member of a diplomatic staff.

The amendment would preserve the authority vested in the President, by regulations to defer from military service certain classes of aliens temporarily residing in the United States, although certain such aliens would be required to register under section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

However, where a temporary resident, not entitled to deferment or exemption, resides in the United States for a period exceeding 1 year, he might be reasonably presumed to intend to establish such permanent residence at some future time and, therefore, under the amendment, he is made liable to service although he is permitted to apply for exemption, thus making himself ineligible for naturalization.

There is absolutely no intention of drafting into the Armed Forces, aliens residing temporarily, in good faith, in this country since nobody desires to have American citizens visiting foreign countries to be drafted into foreign armies. This consideration does not apply, however, to aliens who have accepted the privilege of permanent residence in this country.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have great respect for the gentleman's judgment. I simply ask whether he has given consideration to this question of reciprocity in connection with the treatment shown nationals of different countries. If he has considered it, which I assume he has, and if he is satisfied, I have no question about it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. May I ask the author of the amendment whether he has omitted the language now in the bill on page 27, which provides that this alien who wants to live here can get out of service

merely by saying he does not want to be a citizen, or is that language in his amendment? The whole thing was not read.

Mr. WALTER. Under the language of the bill under consideration and under existing law an alien need but refuse or fail to take out his first papers in order to avoid service. It is entirely possible in the omnibus immigration bill which will soon be reported that first papers may be eliminated entirely.

Mr. VORYS. But does the gentleman's amendment provide that an alien permanent resident here who is of draft age has to register and serve?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly.

Mr. VORYS. I commend the gentleman. I have discussed this matter with him and I want him to understand it is a fine amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I understand this amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is now offering is in accord with the bill H. R. 2000 which I offered and had before the Committee on Armed Services and which was discussed there, and which they presented and modified in form by deleting language which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is now inserting in his amendment. The committee substituted the following language: "any citizens of a foreign country." This does not meet the objective outlined in my bill. Therefore, I am heartily in accord with the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I am glad that it will be adopted, although I could not prevail upon the committee to adopt my bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which becomes necessary as a result of the adoption of the amendment just agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 41, strike out lines 17 through 23, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof, the following:

"(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attaches of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted.'"

ing in the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment becomes necessary because of the adoption of the last amendment. It merely adds that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted. It is under the section which exempts certain officers.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAVENNER: Page 50, after line 19, insert the following new paragraph:

"(w) Section 12 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) The protection granted to officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard by sections 1114 and 111 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby granted to all persons inducted or enlisted in the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title, and to all members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this title.'"

And renumber succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, many Members of this House are probably not aware of the fact that existing Federal law affords protection to members of the Coast Guard against felonious assault while they are engaged in the performance of their official duties, but that no such protection is afforded to the members of any of the other branches of the armed services. If a member of the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps or the Marine Corps should be feloniously beaten or killed while performing his official duties by civilians or by local peace officers, and if the local authorities should not prosecute the assailant, no action could be taken to punish the guilty party or parties under any present provision of Federal law. The purpose of my amendment is to extend the same protection in Federal law to members of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps, which is now afforded to members of the Coast Guard.

The problem is one of long standing. Military authorities and the Department of Justice have been officially on record for nearly a decade in support of legislation to provide Federal protection for all members of the armed services against felonious assault. Under existing law it has long been a Federal offense for any person to kill or assault a Federal civil officer, such as a United States marshal, a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, secret service agents, post office inspectors and other similar officers as well as members of the Coast Guard.

I have placed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the chairman of the Ju-

diciary Committee of the Senate in 1943, by the then Attorney General, Francis Biddle, stating that the Military Establishment had no jurisdiction over offenses committed by a civilian against a member of the military personnel, and expressing the opinion that legislation similar to the amendment which I am now supporting was desirable in the interest of protecting military personnel. In the same year a similar letter was addressed to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate by the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. He enclosed a draft of a bill to provide punishment for killing or assaulting officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police while engaged in the performance of official duties.

I can assure the Members of the House that the Department of National Defense is now in favor of the principle of this proposed legislation. Following the receipt of the letters which I have referred to, the Senate committee reported the legislation favorably and it was passed by the Senate at that time. However, it did not pass the House.

The list of Federal employees who have Federal protection against felonious assaults under various provisions of the United States law includes the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Department of Agriculture, Federal Home Loan Bank, and the Fish and Game Inspectors.

However, thus far the Congress has apparently not considered it to be equally important to protect the members of the armed services.

Mr. Chairman, there are many instances on record in the Department of National Defense of assaults by civilians on members of the armed services which have never been brought to trial in the local courts. In at least one instance, during World War II, a member of a military police detail was killed by a local peace officer. This soldier was on duty at the time he was killed, and had a right to resist arrest by civilian authorities. The United States Attorney General investigated this case but found that the matter could not be brought into a Federal court. In this case the local authorities refused to take the man who did the killing into custody. He got off scot free, without having his guilt determined. The soldier, as I am informed, was on duty at the time of this offense.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There has been a great deal of complaint, as the gentleman knows, about similar assaults taking place off the base when men are on leave. I gather that the gentleman's amendment does not cover that, and I understand why. I would like to emphasize it. I would like to emphasize that to the House, that the gentleman's amendment is confined only to the military service, and is an extension of existing law into what ought to be covered, to wit, all people who are in the service of the United States, as the gentleman proposes. It does not represent any drastic or new inclusion of matters about which many people have complained.



Mr. HAVENNER. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. I simply wish to say that I am in thorough accord with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman's amendment seek to give protection to the personnel of the Armed Forces while engaged in the performance of their official work?

Mr. HAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. With that understanding, I want to indicate my accord with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] close in 5 minutes, and that the committee be recognized to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee is not going to buy a pig in a poke. Everything involved here does not appear on the face of it.

For many years the law has provided that it is a Federal offense to assault a Federal peace officer in the discharge of his duties. The Coast Guard comes under that provision of the code, because in peacetime the Coast Guard exercises duties comparable to those of peace officers. In other words, they are those who enforce the customs laws. They patrol the ports and posts, and things like that. In that respect they are on about the same status as narcotic agents, United States marshals, and others who enforce the Federal laws. So this title of the Code covers all of those people who are in the same circumstances. But when you begin to extend it to the armed services, that is where you come to the bug under the chip. When would a man in the armed services be engaged in duty? Ordinarily a military man is on duty 24 hours a day. There are a number of different definitions in Federal law as to what constitutes duty. In passing upon whether a person disabled or killed is disabled or dies in line of duty, it turns upon whether or not the disability or death was the result of his own misconduct. If not the result of his own misconduct then it is in line of duty. So that the provision that is applied here is subject to interpretation as to when the member of the

Armed Forces is on duty or in the discharge of his duty.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell us whether according to military law a man who is on leave or furlough is on duty so that if he is injured he is considered to have been injured on duty.

Mr. KILDAY. As far as compensation is concerned, if it were not the result of his own misconduct it would be in line of duty for death benefits, and under certain circumstances, for retirement purposes. There has been practically no difficulty about the enforcement of the laws of the State in which men are stationed when they are off of the posts. The Federal Government cannot compel law enforcement, it may be true, but why should we assume that the local officers and prosecuting agencies in all of the States are not going to discharge their duty? As a matter of fact, in times like these, when such large numbers of troops are in the service coming from homes all over the United States, there are the most compelling reasons why the assailant of a man who might be assaulted off the post would be prosecuted with great vigor. This provision, of course, is for the purpose of placing persons of the various States subject to prosecution under the Federal law.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. May I say to the gentleman that I do not desire to stigmatize any particular community or any particular section of this Union. Such offenses could occur anywhere, but the record shows that they have occurred repeatedly, over and over again, and in the one instance that I cited a man was killed without his assailant ever having been brought to trial.

Mr. KILDAY. That, of course, is reprehensible.

There is a long legal history to the question of assaults on Federal officers, the most famous case, of course, coming up in California many years ago where a deputy United States marshal shot or killed a man who attempted to commit an assault on Mr. Justice Fields, of the Supreme Court. The Federal Court there issued a writ of habeas corpus cum causa. It was tried in the Federal court with the Federal attorney defending and the State district attorney prosecuting.

The amendment offered to this bill has ramifications that do not appear on the face of it. It will make for disruption of the service and is a provision that will give us great difficulty.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COX. The amendment takes jurisdiction for prosecuting the crime now in the hands of local authorities and puts it in the hands of the Federal Government.

Mr. KILDAY. It takes such little things as simple assault, affray, and so forth, out of the State courts, justice-

of-the-peace courts, and puts them in the United States district courts.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. May I point out that what we are now talking about is in line of duty or resulting from an offense which may occur in the performance of duty and that those terms have been well defined and construed by statutes which have been in existence since Civil War days?

Mr. KILDAY. It relates to civilian officers and members of the United States Coast Guard who have specific duties in peacetime about identical with the duties of peace officers. But when you extend it to all of the members of the Armed Forces then you are extending it too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time on the pending amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 46, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER: Page 29, line 9, strike out "26" and insert "24."

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I consider important and it should be considered very seriously by the committee. The amendment would cut the term of service of the men inducted under this act from 26 to 24 months, 2 months. The Senate bill provides 24 months, and I have not heard any sound arguments advanced so far as to why we should require 2 months more than the Senate bill requires. I am not certain but I believe that the President now has the authority that if conditions warrant men may be continued in the service for an additional year. This House recently passed a resolution to continue terms of service for an extra year.

Mr. Chairman, this 26 months takes every boy into his third year in the service and it is certain to disrupt the plans and programs of many of the boys because of the 2 months additional and going into the third year.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be seriously considered and should be adopted by the committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. Chairman, yesterday by an overwhelming teller vote the committee rejected this amendment. Now, what is the reason for increasing the length of service from 21 months to 26 months? It is due to the fact that under 21 months' service you only get about 12 months of actual military service. Under 26 months, considering leave, travel, and training periods, you will only get about 17 months of service. Listen. Out of an induction of 26 months you will

only get 17 months of actual military service.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. There is not another nation in the world that requires a man to serve 26 months.

Mr. VINSON. That is no argument at all. This Government should run its affairs for its own interest, irrespective of how other nations run theirs.

Mr. SHAFER. The Government is doing that. It would not amount to a tinker's damn what we do here anyway; they will keep him just as long as they want.

Mr. VINSON. Do not talk that way. Let us be calm.

Mr. SHAFER. I am serious.

Mr. VINSON. Well, it is serious. It is certainly in the interest of economy. I am glad the distinguished gentleman is here, because he is a little bit concerned this morning about economy. I have been trying to get him economy-minded all the time to show him why he should be for some form of universal military training to get away from the \$35,000,000,000 annual expenditure now required for our armed services. It is in the interest of economy because for every month—and listen to this—that you decrease the length of service you increase the cost 5 percent. That is what happens. Now, it is cheaper for the Government to have 26 months' training and service than it is to have 21 months, and the shorter the number of months each inductee serves the greater the number of inductees required.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. This amendment would mean that you have got to necessarily put about 75,000 more men in the pipeline.

Mr. VINSON. It would mean that at least 75,000 more men would have to be immediately called than would be the case if it stood at 26 months. It would require 150,000 more if we did not go from 21 to 26 months. Those are the reasons that prompted the committee to go to 26 months instead of 21 months or 24 months. Now you have a pool of so many men, and the longer a man serves the fewer the number that must be drawn from the pool.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am open-minded on this matter, but it strikes me that there would be some advantage in drawing more men and thus equalizing the services.

Mr. VINSON. It might be, but it is very costly, very expensive, because if you only had 12 months or 6 months you would get more people trained, but you would get less service and it would cost more money.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What was the argument advanced when it was fixed at 21 months as it is now?

Mr. VINSON. Well, the argument advanced for 21 months was that that was about the best we could get at that time. The bill had 24 months and in conference it was reduced to 21 months. I am saying to you right now it is not going to disturb us, but it is going to cost us more money than any other one item in this bill, because your turn-over is so great. You are constantly drawing them from the pool and putting them in the service.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. When it was made 21 months we did not have a national emergency.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. And since that time the Government has been confronted with an emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am rather impressed with the gentleman's great interest in economy, and I appreciate it, but I am hard-pressed to understand how it comes that a plea for a 26 months' term of service can be made by the same individual, on the basis of economy, who brought to the House originally, at least, a plan to train all young Americans for only 6 months. That would be a more costly program than this one.

Mr. VINSON. This is for service in the Armed Forces; the other is a training program. I will say to you in all sincerity, if this Congress will adopt the 6 months' training program it will enable the armed services to reduce its standing Army. Instead of having an annual budget of \$35,000,000, it will be considerably less.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman stating to the House that our Army will be reduced before the present national emergency is over?

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly not.

Mr. VINSON. Of course not, but it will enable them to be in a position where even if an emergency does exist they can reduce it because they have some reservists.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has it not been the gentleman's contention and argument that if universal military training is adopted and becomes effective the men who are now being drafted under his bill, which, if the provisions stand up, will require 26 months of service, will be discharged before those 26 months are up?

Mr. VINSON. I would say the President would have the authority under the language of the bill to do that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The President has many authorities which he has exercised only in part or not exercised at all, or properly, in the opinion of many Americans.

Mr. VINSON. I hope you will not reduce this to 24 months. If you do, it means it will cost that much more, and the armed services will lose that much more service. It means that you will just have to draft that many more men from home.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The chairman of course, and all of us, at the time we were drafting this legislation, were working on the basis of a pool of 1,200,000 men, having in mind the rotation system. No one can determine whether this thing is going to last 26 months or more. Another thing, when we asked them to put 600,000 back into the pool whom they had already deferred because of physical and mental disqualifications, it placed us in a position where we have to try to get these Reserves out with a pool of 1,200,000 men. If you cut it any lower, you could not do it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the gentleman be kind enough to tell us whether in his position in the conference committee, sticking to the 18½-year-olds as against the Senate's 18-year-olds will be joined with a 26-month provision as against the Senate's 24 months? That is a very important point.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to fight for 18½ if the House adopts it and I am going to fight for 26 months if the House adopts it, and stay there until—what would the gentleman from Michigan say?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Until the House directs otherwise.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago the executive branch at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue maneuvered us into World War II. The consequences was that 400,000 American boys died in that war and 400,000 more American boys came back home as neuropsychiatric cases, a form of living death. The national debt of this country went up \$200,000,000,000.

But that is not all. The announced purposes of that war, the four freedoms, went down the sewer.

The Atlantic Charter went into the wastebasket.

But that was not all. The great dikes which have protected Europe and Asia against communism were destroyed in



that war. Germany stood for a thousand years between western Christian civilization and the barbarians of the East. By unconditional surrender, American military power was used to destroy that dike. The blood and treasure of America was used to destroy that dike.

In Asia Japan stood between the people of Asia, and Japan was militarily and industrially and geographically able to hold the dike in Asia against communism.

Who destroyed that dike?

Not communism, not the Russians, but the blood and treasure of American boys was used to destroy that dike. The military might of America was used to destroy that dike. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all.

After the war ended and the brave purposes had gone down the sewers, more billions in American wealth were poured into the hands of Russia and Russian satellite countries. More billions of American wealth were poured into socialistic England, which now seems to control our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, what tyrant in history has sent the boys of his country further from their homes to die in vain and futile conflict than the President of the United States?

This bill proposes to give more power to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, to the people who are responsible for blunder after blunder and who are responsible for western Christian civilization being in more peril today than it ever was before. The dikes against communism were destroyed—not by the Russians, not by the Communists, but by the policies formulated in the executive branch of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country expect this Congress not to surrender more power into these blundering hands. They expect this Congress to represent the people. They expect the Congress to save the people from the blundering hands that have brought the world to the brink of chaos.

Hence, Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment which will in a small way restrict in a small way the power in the hands of those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I am interested, after hearing the gentleman's speech, to learn what his belief is: Do you think Germany and Japan should have won World War II?

Mr. BUFFETT. We could have defeated Germany and Japan in World War II, if we had to insist on getting into it, without destroying those dikes completely by unconditional surrender.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I still do not have an answer to my question. Do you think the United States or Germany or Japan should have won World War II?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will read to the gentleman a little from the report of Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff, to the Secretary of War on September 1, 1945, about that war.

Here are pertinent excerpts from General Marshall's report:

The available evidence shows that Hitler's original intent was to create, by absorption of Germanic peoples in the areas contiguous to Germany and by the strengthening of her new frontiers, a greater Reich which would dominate Europe. \* \* \*

\* \* \* No evidence has yet been found that the German High Command had any over-all strategic plan. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Nor is there evidence of close strategic coordination between Germany and Japan.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would still like to have an answer from the gentleman as to whether or not he favored Germany and Japan winning the war?

Mr. BUFFETT. I did not favor getting into the war.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the committee to have 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think he needs 5 minutes to answer that argument?

Mr. VINSON. No, but I saw the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] standing and I thought probably he wanted some time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why not yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON]?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment pending do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment.

If we are in a national emergency we should even cut it more than that, so that anybody who is sent to war will have at least some experience. I have listened to a great many queer things, it seems to me. We have had a draft bill since 1947.

It seems to me that if we drafted these boys for only a year and a half it would be sufficient.

In 1917 a great many of us saw service. I doubt if there was a man in the Army who was not an excellent soldier within a year. As a matter of fact, we won the war with recruits, with men who were drafted, and in a little less than a year and a half they were back home. If this is a question of money, that is one thing, but it is not a question of money.

It is a question of taking a boy from his family for 2½ years. I almost laughed when I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for whom I have the greatest admiration, state that their actual service was only so much. Their service is 2 years and 6 months under this proposition. All the gentleman is trying to do is to cut it down 2 months. These boys are entitled to get an education. The longer you keep them away from it the less opportunity they will have to get it.

As for myself personally, I do not believe in drafting men to go to Korea to fight for something that they do not know anything about, or anybody else. I object to sending them to Europe or anywhere else, unless it is in time of war. If we are in such dire straits and we need all these things, let us protect our own shores.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, it will take me 90 seconds to say what I want to say. It is time for the MacArthur incident to be treated by everyone concerned solely from the standpoint of our national interest. Nobody is more sick at heart than I over the President's recall of General MacArthur. I personally believe it has done untold damage to our country. Also, nobody is more disturbed than I am over the developments since the President's action was announced, because too many are taking political sides in this situation. The one person who can present General MacArthur's point of view is General MacArthur himself, and the attempts of others to speak for him can only be dangerous to the interests of our country. Let us wait until we can hear from MacArthur himself in person.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe we all agree that one reason that we have to raise this large military force is to preserve the right of the gentleman from Nebraska and others of like mind to make a speech of the kind that he made just a few moments ago. I was amazed to find that a Member of the House would not give an unequivocal answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] as to whether he felt that Germany and Japan should have won the war. I accept that as an indication of the type of hysteria which has seized the country. Nevertheless, it stands as amazing when a Member of this House is not willing to state unequivocally who he feels should have won the war.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. For an answer, yes; for an argument, no.

Mr. BUFFETT. For an explanation of my statement. I was answering the question whether or not we should have got in the war. So far as winning the war—

Mr. KILDAY. I will ask the question now that the gentleman from Missis-

issippi asked: Does the gentleman now feel that Germany and Japan should have won the war?

Mr. BUFFETT. The answer is emphatically "No."

Mr. KILDAY. Why did you not say so?

Mr. BUFFETT. And the question was an insult. If the question was phrased in the way the gentleman put it now, I misunderstood it.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman contends that he misunderstood him?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will have to look at the RECORD. Maybe the gentleman never misunderstands another person; I admit very frankly that sometimes I do; most people do.

Mr. KILDAY. Perhaps I did the gentleman an injustice. It now appears that he will answer no question unequivocally.

Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

As to the amendment pending—

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman also spoke of World War I. I should like to know his position on World War I.

Mr. KILDAY. Now, as to the amendment; the amendment would reduce the term of service from 26 to 24 months. This was rather thoroughly discussed in the opening portion of the debate, and it was pointed out then, and it is abundantly clear now, that these men by the very provisions of the bill we are considering shall have 4 months' basic training in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; that they shall not be assigned to a combat zone until they have had 6 months of training. It is also clear that they will be entitled to approximately 1 month of leave, and experience shows that in travel and moving from station to station and getting to their outfits and things of that kind it consumes on the average two additional months; so by retaining it at 26 months you can only anticipate actual service of 17 months from those inducted under the provisions of the act. If you reduce it two additional months, then you are down to 15 months of actual service under the provisions of the act.

I personally oppose any reduction in the period of training of 6 months, and I am sure we all oppose denying these boys a leave prior to departure from the country. That is all taken into consideration in the 26 months of service which we have provided in this bill.

The Senate bill, of course, does provide for 24 months of service and goes down to 18 years of age. Those are matters, of course, which must go to conference and should go to conference so that full discussion may be had as to the reasons for the Senate provision of 24 months and our provision of 26, and that we can bring it back to the respective Houses for final action.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the provision will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 60, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 30, strike out all of line 10 through 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Within the limits of the over-all military manpower needs of the United States and notwithstanding any other provision of law any person whether a citizen of the United States or of any friendly nation and any national of Western Germany or Japan who meets all the other qualifications for service in the Armed Forces of the United States and who is determined by the Armed Forces of the United States to be attached to the principles of freedom and democracy shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"The terms of service and grade, commissioned or enlisted, for persons not citizens of the United States and accepted for enlistment under this section shall be in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the President: *Provided, however*, That no such person not a citizen of the United States shall be given a grade higher than that of captain or its equivalent.

"*Provided further*, That no veterans' benefits as now or as may be hereafter provided by the laws of the United States shall accrue to any enlistee or officer not a citizen of the United States and accepted under the provisions of this section; nor shall any such enlistee or officer acquire any special rights or preference in connection with the attainment of United States citizenship by reason of the service authorized herein."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas upon the ground that it indirectly affects the naturalization laws of the country which are not a part of the pending measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order in order for the gentleman to state his position.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is the same amendment as was offered here yesterday. I do not care for the gentleman to reserve his point of order, but I would like to make a statement to the chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, of course, we did not make a point of order yesterday, but the committee rejected it.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. It is the same amendment the gentleman offered yesterday?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I want to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply changes the provisions under which persons may be taken into the armed services of the United States. The bill now provides that within certain limits persons of prescribed ages shall be given an opportunity to come into the service of the United States. We change those conditions and

one of the limitations we impose is to say that no one shall become a citizen of the United States simply by virtue of this act. That in no wise changes or in any manner affects the present immigration laws of the United States because there is no immigration law of the United States that says that anyone who serves under the terms of this bill shall or shall not become a citizen of the United States. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it cannot possibly affect the immigration laws of the United States because there is no law of the United States that relates to the matter.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am not pressing my point of order in order that the gentleman may discuss his amendment.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentlemen's forbearance but I want the point of order decided right now. If you gentlemen do not want to face this issue, I want the record to so show.

Mr. COLE of New York. We faced the issue on yesterday.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Would it not be necessary for him to take the oath of allegiance?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; he would have to take the oath.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. What kind of oath would he take, not being a citizen of the United States?

Mr. POAGE. He would take the same oath that any citizen takes who goes into the United States Army. The oath that one takes when he goes into the United States Army is not a citizenship oath.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from New York be kind enough to point out the provision in the pending amendment which he thinks definitely amends other existing law?

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I do not have the amendment before me. All I know of it is hearing it read at the Clerk's desk. My attention was arrested to the latter part of the amendment which related definitely to existing citizenship and other laws.

Mr. POAGE. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it does not relate to existing citizenship laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment presented by the gentleman from Texas states:

(2) Within the limits of the over-all military manpower needs of the United States, and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any person, whether a citizen of the United States or any friendly nation, and any national of Western Germany or Japan who meets all other qualifications for service in the Armed Forces of the United States and who is determined by the Armed Forces of the United States to be attached to the principles of freedom and democracy, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from New York if he thinks there is



anything up to that point that would not be germane to the pending bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Certainly, if the Chairman, having the amendment in his hands, cannot find anything that is subject to a point of order, I am not in a position to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that on the face of the amendment, as it appears, it would be germane to the pending bill, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that a few of you voted down on yesterday after the committee limited debate to two 5-minute speeches. I think that any proposal to save American boys and American dollars is worthy of more discussion. This is the same amendment that I have discussed before this House on several occasions.

The whole issue is, Are you willing to use all of the resources to secure all of the men we need in our Armed Forces to carry on our global defense, or are you convinced that you must place the entire burden of the world on the shoulders of American boys? Are you willing to pay the salaries of those who would volunteer from other lands to serve in this world-wide defense effort or do you prefer to go out and grab some American boy by the nape of the neck and force him to serve against his will and possibly to the injury of our domestic economy?

I want the members of this committee to understand the question this amendment puts before us. I do not want anybody to hide out behind the proposition, "How will you make citizens out of these people?" The bill does not make citizens out of anyone. It does not use American citizenship as a bribe. It simply says that if a man in Germany for example wants to serve in the United States Army, to stand with the forces of freedom between his own German home and the forces of dictatorship, that we will give him the opportunity to do so. It says that if we can recruit a man from Tokyo and put a gun over his shoulder and get him to go over and do some of the fighting in Korea instead of sending a boy from St. Louis, then by this amendment, we offer him the opportunity to do so.

It means that we give you a practical means of using the manpower now in the Nationalist Army of China. It gives the Army an opportunity to work out a method of using these men under the American flag, where they would take orders from our own military commanders; where we would avoid the dangers that so many see in depending on foreign leadership. It simply says that the United States of America is going to command those who fight at our expense over the far-flung battlefields of this world.

It leaves all the details to this Government. In fact, it lets the Armed Forces themselves decide on the qualifications of those who would enlist and on the conditions of their service. It simply proclaims the policy of using everybody we can. It even leaves it in the power of the conference committee to make changes and improvements in the details.

Is the Armed Services Committee afraid of itself?

I call the chairman's attention to the great speech he made on economy a while ago. I know the chairman will be fair enough to realize that you can maintain a division of German nationals in Germany as a part of the American Army more cheaply than you can maintain a division of American boys in Germany under the American flag. You can strengthen the economy of every one of the countries from which we enlist men by carrying this program into effect. If you would but employ some of these Germans in the American Army, you would not have to be sending so much money and economic aid to Germany. For every dollar that you spend in paying the salary of a German national who you keep in Germany it will put a dollar into the economy of Germany, just as truly as if you sent it as a gift. Every time you spend a dollar under this amendment you can withdraw a dollar from the economic support you give to the countries in which you pay the soldier. If you want to save for the American taxpayers millions of dollars, if you want to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys, I cannot see how you can conscientiously say that you are not going to give consideration to passing this amendment this afternoon.

I know the chairman is going to tell you that they had General Eisenhower before the committee and he said he was not in favor of a Hessian Army. I hope the chairman will tell you why General Eisenhower said he was not in favor of it. I hope those who object to this will tell you why, rather than simply hiding behind some high-sounding words to the effect that "we do not want a Hessian Army," that we do not want any mercenary troops in the United States Army. Why do you not want them in the Army? Do you not want to do everything you can to avoid bringing back any more caskets with American flags over them than we have to? Are your feelings so strong against what you may consider an undignified position for the military commanders of our country that you would rather return caskets than to provide for the use of foreign troops? If any of you feel so strongly or have such a pride in our 100-percent American forces you might consider an amendment to this bill which would allow Congressmen to volunteer regardless of age or physical fitness.

How can you object to allowing anyone who will to join in the maintenance of the peace of the world, a job of protecting their own homes as well as our homes?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. As I recall the newspaper comment on General Eisenhower's statement, it was that he does not want a ragtag of mercenaries. He did not say he did not want foreign nationals enlisted to serve under our flag. May I point out that this matter already has been favorably acted on in the other body. It is a part of their bill.

Mr. POAGE. Under this amendment we do not ask that you force any man into the service of the United States. We say, "Give any man a chance to serve if he wants to."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas would not yield to me, I desire to ask him a question in regard to the proposal he has made. I do that because, while the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] had proposed an amendment here this morning, I was in my office checking the code and statutes working on an amendment along the same lines. They do differ somewhat, but I will not take the time to discuss that at this particular time.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] what does he say about the aliens or noncitizens who have already been inducted into the armed services or have volunteered their services and are now fighting in the uniform of the United States in Korea. Would he deny citizenship to them?

Mr. POAGE. My amendment does not say anything about them. This would not change their status one way or the other. They retain any rights that they may have acquired. I simply say that if a man comes in under provision, it does not give him any special rights. That is all the amendment says.

Mr. SADLAK. May I ask the gentleman, would he have any objection to a proposal that those now serving in the Army of the United States, in our uniform, and who had come legally to the United States and who had been inducted or volunteered, should be granted immediately the privilege of United States citizenship?

Mr. POAGE. I would not deny them any privileges that they have under the present law. This would give them every privilege that they now have. It neither adds nor detracts from their present rights.

Mr. SADLAK. There is no privilege given under the gentleman's amendment because the law granting expeditious citizenship to those serving in the Armed Forces expired on December 31, 1946, and therefore there is no way in which he can obtain citizenship now earlier than waiting the period of 5 years.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, but the situation is in nowise altered by this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I merely have a couple of observations to contribute. The very argument made

by the gentleman from Texas in seeking to have his proposal adopted, would be answered by merely hiring these various foreigners to fight for the United States Government. I cannot see any reason for bringing them into the United States armed service to be classified as American boys if we merely want their assistance to prevent young men in this country from having to serve in the Army during the time of emergency. We can hire those foreign soldiers as cheap as we would need to pay them to become members of the United States Army. I think it would be more logical to hire foreigners to fight for us than to hire them to become members of our Army to thereafter be treated as United States veterans of the United States armed services.

Mr. CLEMENTE. And if they were brought into the Armed Forces, they would be entitled to compensation for injuries and so forth.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; we will save money by hiring foreigners to fight for us rather than hiring them to become a part of us. Even though this proposal would not classify these foreigners for veteran benefits, a later Congress will be duty bound to treat such foreign veterans the same as veteran citizens of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] did not answer, and that is to say that the Poage amendment expressly provides against the payment of veterans' benefits to foreign nationals who are taken into the United States Army under this amendment. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, provides the means to answer that question which is being asked all over the United States of America today. The people are wondering why the nationals of other countries are not being used, and you know as well as I do that we are now feeling earth-shaking tremors because that question has not been answered.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I would also favor legislation which would allow us to hire soldiers to fight for the United States, but do you not know that the next Congress that comes here after some of these fellows are injured or wounded in action will pass legislation giving them the same benefits as soldiers of the United States Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I cannot say what some other Congress may do and I cannot be responsible for that. I do want to say this about the mercenary question. I have asked the military men about that and everytime I have asked the question they have told me that the United States Army does not want mercenaries. They say that mercenary soldiers are no good. I will grant that and go a step further. Mercenary citizens are no good. That has nothing to do with this amendment because foreign nationals who will be taken into the

Army under this amendment will be joining a force that is dedicated to the destruction of communism, the common enemy of all free peoples. Therefore, I submit that such foreign nationals would not stand in the status of mercenaries. These foreign nationals who profess to want freedom and to fight communism will be given the opportunity under this amendment to do something besides talk, and they will have the opportunity to be paid for it. It is their countries which are primarily being overrun and if they want to fight to stop the tide, now is the time to put them to the test. People have asked over and over why the Chinese Nationalists have not been used. This amendment will permit the induction of as many of the Chinese Nationalists who want to come into the United States Army and I want to see the opportunity afforded them to show how sincere they are in their professed desire to fight communism. This country has furnished the materials and the guns to the other free nations of this world, and it is high time that we let those countries furnish some of the men to pull the triggers on those guns. We cannot continue to pay the bill and in addition to furnish the manpower. This amendment will permit these foreign nationals to be under the control of American officers, where they should be. You Members who have stood on this floor and spoken so eloquently and so exhaustively espousing the use of Chinese Nationalists have in this amendment the opportunity to realize what you have said you want. I want the Chinese Nationalists used and that is why I am going to vote for this amendment, and I think that if you are sincere in what you have been saying, you ought to vote for the amendment, too. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support the pending amendment. However, I rose primarily to stress the fact that the legislation that we are presently considering is of the greatest possible interest to all classes of our people. There is no doubt that every Member of Congress agrees with me that this legislation is of tremendous interest to home folks of all classes. This fact was most forcefully brought out by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. Having served in the last war with an outfit in which there were many boys of about 18 years of age, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] would naturally know the interest of these young men who are now in a very uncertain attitude. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] held a number of meetings which were attended by many high-school boys and also by high-school girls and their parents. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] comes from the large city of Akron, Ohio, and his audiences were very representative. He threw the meetings open so that the boys could express their views. These meetings claimed the attention of many people. Life magazine took an interest

in the meetings of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] and took many pictures which graphically depict the great interest shown in these meetings. The current issue of this magazine will be interesting to you. I recommend that you read this magazine and look at the pictures. I compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] on his great idea and of the success of his meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized.

Mr. BRAY. As for the theory that it is against our Government's policies for aliens to serve in American armies, that is entirely in error. To my personal knowledge, I remember both Chinese and Korean aliens serving in the American Army. I know nothing as to their numbers, but any such objection to letting them go into the armed services is entirely erroneous.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why we should not use these individuals from other countries to fight on our side if they are willing to fight.

Recently I was disappointed when we learned that some 150,000 South Koreans were sent home and not allowed to fight. I never could understand why the South Koreans should not be permitted to fight. There is another 300,000 Koreans who are anxious to fight. Instead of sending our 18-year-old boys to fight their battles for them, we should let them, we should let them do the fighting.

This amendment has a great deal of merit. I hope you will give it earnest consideration. This country can use the services of our friends from other countries. The committee should adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the idea of using troops other than from our own country, I have not been hostile to that idea. As a matter of fact, I have made speeches in behalf of it; but I have examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and I think it is in very poor form. It will give us a great deal of trouble. In the first place, the amendment strikes out a part of the bill which permits voluntary inductions of men into our own service. I do not think that part ought to be stricken out.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The amendment specifically allows any American citizen to enlist; it includes those boys stricken out.

Mr. BROOKS. But the gentleman's amendment on page 30 strikes out lines 10 to 17.



Mr. POAGE. And inserts the provision whereby all those boys can come in.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman can explain that in his own time. I am not convinced that it does.

Another thing that I find objectionable: I like the thought of the Philippine Constabulary. If his amendment contained a provision something along the line of the Philippine Constabulary which could be handled as a separate organization, not a part of the Army, I think maybe it would have serious merit. But when you come to take in a large body of troops made up of diverse nationalities I doubt the wisdom of doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think the proponents of this proposal have not thought through this problem to its full conclusion. This is not a new matter for the Armed Services Committee; we gave consideration to that problem a year or so ago and eventually authorized a bill which eventually became legislation approving an over-all total of 2,500 foreigners to be in our Armed Forces.

One of the main difficulties of accepting this kind of proposal is that the first thing we would have to do would be to spend about 2 years teaching these aliens the English language so they would know that when they got the order to charge they would charge instead of retreating. That is just one of the many problems entailed in bringing large numbers of foreigners into the Army to wear the uniform of the United States.

My other criticism of the amendment is that while we ostensibly welcome these people with open arms to fight with us we deny to them the financial benefits that other veterans enjoy. To me that is not right; to me that is rather shabby, cheap treatment accorded to a person who is willing to accept the risks of service in our Army.

Another objectionable feature is the limitation that no matter how brilliant the foreigner may be he may not rise above the rank of captain. What sort of treatment is that? In effect we say to them you can come in and do the dirty work but none of you can hope to progress and get ahead. These are just some of the problems that the amendment poses. Its objective is quite all right. The committee has recognized the value of the proposal in times past and has reported appropriate legislation with that end in view, but this amendment has been poorly drafted and will defeat its own good purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, to me this proposition proposed in this amendment is like having a man serve two masters. A man will necessarily have to take the oath of allegiance to the United States.

This has also been tried, if you will read history; it was tried by the English. The Hessians ran off and left them at a very critical time.

I think that a plan can be devised, and I am in favor of it, of trying to use all of

the personnel we can possibly secure; there is certainly a proper place and a proper time to use it, but not in this proposal. In my opinion it would be disastrous to morale and it would be a positive hindrance in my opinion to operations of a successful campaign in any theater of war. Then the complications after a war such as citizenship and benefits of many kinds.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, no major or insurmountable difficulties have been raised in connection with this question, no difficulty that cannot be surmounted by military discipline and by the terms under which these men are enlisted.

My friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] referred to the Hessians.

The Hessians did not enlist in the British Army; they were sold into service. On the other hand, the French Foreign Legion is an example of a workable system of enlisting foreign nationals. They apparently do not have serious language or other difficulties. For a few cents a day the French get all the foreign nationals they want for their Army; and they are depending on those foreign nationals, mostly German citizens, to save Indochina for them today.

Adoption of this provision means less disruption of American homes, less interference with careers and schooling, because it will lessen materially the requirements for service by our own people. It certainly provides additional opportunity to spread the teachings of Americanism.

Mr. Chairman, this is not offered as a joke. It provides an opportunity to save American manpower. That is not a joke. It provides an opportunity to save American lives. That is not a joke. It provides an opportunity to save money. That is not a joke, either.

There should be no question about this. It is already in the Senate bill and any difficulties in language may be worked out in conference between the two bodies. We do not offer these people much in return for their help in world defense, no veterans' benefits, no citizenship. But it is a known fact that many foreign nationals want to enlist in our forces. We will be able to get all of them that we want to use.

We seek to tap an almost unlimited source of trained manpower. They include some of the best soldiers in the world. This proposal would avoid sending some American boys to far corners of the world at considerable cost, if you please, and at a considerable loss of time.

It is well known that we must be prepared to defend much of the world. I think we should get all the help we can.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee overwhelmingly rejected this amendment after debate yesterday. I certainly hope the time has not come

when America's battles will have to be fought by going out and trying to hire foreign nationals in our ranks. There would be one, two, or three companies or regiments of this race, and one, two, or three regiments of that race. There would be just as much confusion as there is going on up in the United Nations right now. You can see what that is getting us into.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 56, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that the entire bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request will not foreclose the offering of any further amendments to the first section of the bill?

Mr. VINSON. No; it will not. It opens the whole bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the 81st Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1952" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act."

(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953."

SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act, except members of the reserve components.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 26, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided*, That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written preference to discharge their obligation for training in the National Security Training Corps or training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race,

which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training or training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit."

SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE: Page 53, line 19, after the word "hereunder", strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the language in the section.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I recall, yesterday we discussed this thing for about an hour. It was hotly contested and closely divided. May I suggest the gentleman give us 20 minutes, because I think there are Members who want to speak on it who do not happen to be here at this time.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest that the debate be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, this, of course, is the identical amendment which was adopted yesterday to strike from the Barden substitute the segregation language contained therein. With the rejection of the Barden substitute it becomes necessary to amend the bill now under consideration to accomplish what the membership of this House indicated it desired to do when by a vote of 178 to 126 it eliminated the segregation provision.

There is no need for extended debate on this amendment today as I believe it was fully explained in the 2 hours it was under discussion on yesterday. I propose at this time to very briefly reiterate the arguments which I presented then in support of the amendment in order to refresh the minds of the Members as to the importance of striking from the bill the present language.

For the purpose of clarification—my amendment will strike from the bill the proviso on page 53 beginning on line 19, which in effect calls for segregation under the law. In my opinion and in the opinion of the armed services the provision is administratively unworkable. The Department of Defense has indicated its opposition when similar provisions were offered to previous bills.

As I said yesterday the Armed Forces

of the United States have in the past 5 years made progress away from racial segregation. The Air Force and the Navy today have a policy of nonsegregation throughout the services. The morale and efficiency of the troops have been improved as a result. No incidents have occurred to warrant a reversal of this trend.

Negro and white soldiers are fighting in the far corners of the world and they appreciate each other as United States citizens with equal responsibilities as well as equal rights. There is no room for second-degree American citizenship among our fighting forces in Korea—and there is no room for secondary citizenship anywhere in this great Nation—the Armed Forces included.

Both great political parties recognize this. In their party platforms in 1948 both pledged their efforts in opposition to the idea of racial segregation in the armed services of the United States.

Those entrusted with the responsibility of directing our Military Establishment believe that the adoption of a provision—such as now contained in the bill—giving men the right to choose whether they wish to serve in segregated units and making it mandatory on the Armed Forces to carry out that choice, except where military necessity forbids, would interfere substantially with the efficient fulfillment by the services of their military missions.

Since there are no segregated units in the Navy or Air Force it would necessitate a major reorganization of both of these services to provide opportunities for segregation in training or in subsequent service assignment. Both services would be severely limited in their freedom to assign personnel where they could be used most effectively if such a requirement were written into law.

In the Army there are no segregated training divisions to which men could be sent. Outside the training divisions, where segregated Army units do exist, the proposed amendment would take control over assignment away from the Army and give it to the individual. Commanding officers would not be able to assign men where they were needed most but would be compelled to send them to segregated units unless they could find some imperative military reason for doing otherwise. Every assignment made contrary to a man's expressed wish would open up the prospect of disaffection, increased racial tension, appeals to higher authority and lawsuits.

Special difficulties would attend the assignment of men possessing critically needed skills. These assignments must be made on the basis of qualifications, rather than color. Failure to follow this practice would complicate the operating problems of military units.

Difficulties could also arise from the necessity for respecting the desire of men from relatively small racial groups to be in segregated units of their own. It would be hard to concentrate Malaysians or Mongolians, for example, in special groups if they expressed a wish for such treatment.

The net effect of the proposed amendment would be to impair the flexibility of military assignment with consequent great loss in the operating efficiency of the armed services.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman believe that one of the best arguments that has been made on behalf of the amendment is the remark made by the chairman of the committee in connection with the Poage amendment when he said, "We do not want any segregation in the Army on the basis of race?"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be controlled by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get recognition for the 4 days we have been considering this bill for amendment in order to propose an amendment, one which I have sponsored every time the draft bill has been up. The text of the amendment is as follows:

My amendment was intended to declare it as the policy of Congress that there should be no discrimination in selection, or service, on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.

I should like to inform the House that I will not now offer that amendment. I do that in deference to the antisegregation vote which the House cast yesterday, and because I have faith that the House will be consistent. I think a magnificent illustration was given yesterday of the fact that we believe in the principles of the Constitution, both in the general tone of the debate and in the vote that was cast. I think a great speech was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and I think a great speech was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. I think it is only fair, therefore, that the question not be labored further in this debate by anybody for any purposes, in the sincere faith that the House shall express its will on this amendment as it expressed its will on the situation yesterday.

I should like to add this one point: Let it be clear that if there had not been the votes against segregation in the armed services on the Republican side of the aisle yesterday this Winstead proposal could never have been stricken out of the bill, and it will not be today unless the Republican votes for the same purpose are available. So many of us have always maintained that this fight against segregation and discrimination is a bipartisan issue. The votes have to come from the Republican side of the aisle to be added to those on the Democratic side if a fight like this is to be won. That is a happy idea, that we should combine



in doing decent things. I am hopeful that the same votes we had yesterday will be forthcoming today to defeat this provision contained in the bill which would turn the clock back and force segregation even where it has already been eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, in voting on this amendment to the bill to increase the strength of the armed services, it seems to me that we are really voting whether or not to plant land mines and booby traps of prejudice all through our armed services—deadly deposits of fear, discrimination that would weaken the armed services from within and would hand to Communist propagandists throughout the world new ammunition with which to attack us.

We have heard plain talk from our esteemed colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], who is the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments. He speaks rarely on this floor, but always to the point. He has laid the issue on the line. Are we, by our vote to say that in the armed services we are going to legislate segregation and discrimination, to set up first- and second-class citizenship—and just at a time when the armed services themselves are making progress in breaking down such practices and are finding that unsegregated units are successful, that American fighting men can work and fight together better than in Jim Crow units that deny the very ideals for which we are fighting?

The gentleman from Illinois has challenged every Member of this House. He once laid his life on the altar of his country's need. He is a combat veteran, painfully disabled by the loss of a leg. I happen to know that the same heroism of stubborn fortitude he displayed on the battlefield is displayed in his work in this House. I know that he has walked from his office to this floor and back again when every step was pain and agony, that he has stayed on the floor for hours and days when a lesser man would have been in a hospital. Today he is the symbol of the principle that shall be upheld or denied by our vote on the amendment that proposes to require young inductees to elect, at the time of their induction, whether to serve in segregated or unsegregated units. If we vote for this amendment, we will not succeed in degrading the millions of members of minority groups for whom the gentleman from Illinois has spoken with such force and feeling, we will have succeeded only in degrading ourselves and the standing of our country at a time when our democratic preachments are under Communist attack everywhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to have served in the last war. I know that men under fire do not practice Jim Crow. I know that the reforms that the armed services have started will strengthen the morale and the fighting power of our men. To cancel out, weaken, or in any way impede those re-

forms will sap morale and weaken fighting power as effectively as could any deliberate sabotage.

I endorse the thorough, closely reasoned, and, to my mind, unanswerable arguments for the amendment that has been presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], to strike out the segregation requirement.

The eyes, ears, hearts, and minds of more than 1,000,000,000 people of the colored races are focused upon us as we debate and vote up this amendment. All of them are the continual target of Communist attempts at infiltration and subversion. If we vote to defeat this segregation amendment, we will have disappointed the Communists and we will have given renewed support, by action to the words that we and other members of the United Nations are saying to the peoples of the world. This, Mr. Chairman, is a show-down in the battle for men's minds and loyalties that is as important as any major military campaign. I urge the Members of the House to vote for the Price amendment to strike from this bill the provision for segregated units in the armed services.

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to yield the balance of the time allotted to him to Mr. HOLIFIELD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire in the limited time to make an impassioned appeal on this subject. It is a matter of conscience with all of us, and we are all entitled to our own opinion on it. In World War II we had the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regiment of Japanese, which was a segregated unit. Most of these Japanese-Americans came from California. That particular unit received more casualties than any other regiment, I understand, in World War II, and also more decorations. I recently talked with Mike Masaoka, one of the heroes of the Four Hundred and Forty-second and the national legislative representative of that organization, and here is part of the statement of his organization, the Japanese-American Citizens League:

We found that simply because we were Japanese-Americans, or that we were members of a segregated outfit, the German enemy did not alter his fire or his tactics.

We discovered that a bullet killed a man regardless of whether he was a Japanese-American from a relocation center, or a Mexican-American from Colorado, an Irishman from Boston, a Negro from Atlanta, or a Jew from Brooklyn. We saw that the blood of all men flowed red from the wounds of battle; we heard the same screams of pain from the lips of all the distressed.

We learned that all men can fight, and all can die.

The wartime experiences of the Japanese-American soldiers, both as members of a special segregated unit and, later, as members of a nonsegregated organization, suggests that in terms of human dignity as well as in terms of maximum efficiency to fight and win a war a policy of nonsegregation, of equal treatment and opportunity, is best and most in keeping with American ideals and aspirations.

We believe that segregation wastes manpower because it reduces the number of

experts available for the more skilled operations of modern war.

We believe that segregation creates and foments distinctions and antagonisms between groups, destroying that harmonious relationship between troops that is necessary to achieve victory.

We believe that segregation plays into the hands of our enemies and thereby enables them to rally forces to their banners which ought to rush to ours.

We believe that in the armed services, where one serves his country, there should be no discrimination in treatment or opportunity because of race, color, creed, or national origin. For such sanctioned segregation by the Military Establishment serves to create and strengthen prejudice and discrimination in nonmilitary and civilian life. In this way, what the armed services do influences all other aspects of American life, to either the detriment or the betterment of our society as a whole.

Thus, we urge this committee to take positive action to end all segregation in the armed services. We urge this, not only that the services as a whole will benefit, but that individuals serving with the Armed Forces will take an increasingly cooperative part in them. And, in the final analysis, we urge this action so that all America will have another example of democracy at work.

On the subject of waste of human life and skills because of the inability to fill vacancies with segregated replacements it states:

Another problem faced by the Four Hundred and Forty-second because of its segregated nature was that of replacements. Since only Japanese-Americans could be used as replacements for the unit, there were times when the Four Hundred and Forty-second was hard put to field enough troops to carry out their assignments.

Most of the enlisted personnel of the Four Hundred and Forty-second qualified for officer-candidate schools, yet very few—less than five of the original group of almost 5,000 in the combat team—were selected.

Once the Four Hundred and Forty-second was committed to action, however, many Japanese-Americans were given combat or battlefield commissions as second lieutenants. By the time the infantry regiment was inactivated in 1946, some 367 officers had been assigned to it. Of this number, only 90, including the warrant officers, were Japanese-Americans. About 75 were combat appointments. The highest rank attained was that of major. Of the 11 Japanese-Americans who were commissioned captains, three were chaplains and five were doctors or dentists.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee support the Price amendment in the name of democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, talked on this subject yesterday. I will not burden you by repeating what I consider the unanswerable argument in favor of the provisions of the bill which I had inserted therein. Yesterday I presented statements from Gen. Omar Bradley and many other military leaders with reference to their views on the question of some segregation in the armed services. I would like to present to you excerpts from a pamphlet issued by the War Department in 1944—Command of Negro Troops. It says:

WASHINGTON 25, D. C., February 29, 1944: War Department Pamphlet No. 20-6, Com-

mand of Negro Troops, is published for information and guidance of all concerned.  
Signed by the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,  
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,  
Adjutant General.

Mr. Chairman, this shows a poll was taken and that a majority of the Negroes expressed themselves. Here is the question asked:

Do you think that white and Negro soldiers should be in separate outfits, or should they be together in the same outfit?

Here is the Negro poll:

Separate outfit, 38 percent; no preference or undecided, 26 percent; same outfit or integrated unit, 36 percent.

Mr. Chairman, that shows that more of the Negroes themselves expressed a preference for the segregated outfit than those who preferred integrated units, and the whites expressed themselves 88 percent in favor of the segregated unit.

Another question asked and I quote:

Question: "Do you think it is a good idea or a poor idea to have separate service clubs in Army camps?"

Negro:

Percent saying good idea.....	48
Percent saying poor idea.....	39
Undecided .....	13

White:

Percent saying good idea.....	85
All other answers.....	15

This chart may be surprising, in view of the statement made earlier that almost all Negroes dislike segregation. The number of Negroes who said they thought white and Negro soldiers should be in the same outfit was about as large as the group saying they should be in separate outfits, while a quarter of the men were undecided. The explanation is that the men were not asked whether they liked or disliked the idea of separate outfits. They were given a practical question about an immediate problem, not a question about an ideal situation in an ideal world. Men's written statements on why they favored separate outfits showed that they opposed segregation in principle, but also desired to avoid friction. On the other hand, many of the men who opposed separation in the Army thought such a policy inconsistent with the aims for which the Nation is fighting.

White soldiers, by a great majority, favored racial separation in the Army. This held true for both Northerners and Southerners. However sound their reasons may or may not be, this mass sentiment cannot be ignored.

These findings must not be taken to mean that white and colored soldiers dislike each other so much that they should never be allowed to come in contact with each other, or that there is certain to be trouble at a mixed post. There is a great body of evidence to the contrary. What the findings do indicate is no more and no less than that the odds are very much in favor of less interracial friction if colored and white enlisted men continue to be organized in separate military units.

War Department instructions provide that post exchanges and theaters, or sections of theaters, and other recreational facilities may be designated for the use of particular military units, but not for the use of a certain race or color group. Existing instructions make it clear, moreover, that it is not the policy of the War Department to require racial separation in off-duty activities. The burden of deciding whether or not there shall be some separation in the use of camp facilities is placed on the local command, with the

assumption that local conditions will be taken into account. There is added the specific ban on use of resented reference to race or color.

Was not that sound? That is what the provision I proposed would provide. That is what the Price amendment would strike out.

May I ask you how you expect the military leaders who have said so often that they believed it was necessary to have at least some segregated units to be able to handle this proposition? Yet, they ask why the military leaders do not come out against the President's directive. We have had an example recently in the Pacific with General MacArthur, a real military leader. They say he did not go along. What happened to him?

How can it be said that I seek to make a second-class citizen out of any man? I have nothing but the highest praise to offer for our Negroes who have fought. I am only offering a peaceful solution of this complicated and rather involved problem, to let the military work this thing out with common sense.

May I say again, if we get these political committees, who are so active during political campaigns, to get their feet off the necks of the military, they will be able to solve this situation. That is all this amendment does. It gives to the Negro the same right as to the white. Why should he not express himself in a common sense way? Common sense would permit him some choice in the matter.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is not the Defense Department opposed to the inclusion of this provision and prefers to have it stricken?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I am glad you asked me that. If they have made a single public statement in opposition to my provision, I know nothing about it. In fact, many of them have assured me they have not. You are talking about a bill which I introduced 2 years ago and you are talking about an amendment that Senator RUSSELL presented on the Senate floor 2 years ago when even General Eisenhower and all of them were contending that they should have some segregated units in the UMT. If any man can bring forth a single statement for or against this amendment from any branch of the armed services, I would like to see it.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I can give assurance to the House that the position I outlined in my argument on this bill is the feeling of the Defense Establishment.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I have been advised otherwise and in view of General MacArthur you can understand they cannot publicly support my provisions which are counter to the President's directive. There is nothing compulsory about my amendment where it interferes with military efficiency. In the bill I introduced 2 years ago it demanded the military to give a man his choice, which would have involved an administrative problem. But there will be no admini-

istrative problem in connection with this amendment because the military determines when to have segregation and when not to.

I hope you will defeat the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL), there were—ayes 107, noes 101.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRICE and Mr. KILDAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 138, noes 123.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on all sections of the bill and all amendments thereto at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 52, line 14, after the word "duty", strike out the period and add the following: "and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter to be declared by the Congress."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the acceptance of this amendment. Because of the lateness of the hour and the number of amendments still to be acted upon, I have no desire to take a great deal of time.

I would like to assert, as emphatically as I know how, that this amendment does not even begin to provide fair and decent treatment for those in the Reserves, particularly those with service in World War II. Nor does it rectify the shameful injustices that have been perpetrated on great numbers of the Reserves since the outbreak in Korea.

As the committee bill stood, and as this amendment now stands, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps active and Organized Reserves are not eligible for release as are inactive and volunteer Reserves, even though, like the others, they serve 12 months of active duty since Korea and had previously served 90 days or more prior to June 1948. That is why, in my original amendment, I specifically covered men in all Reserve components in the Armed Forces. That would have provided at least a measure of decent, nondiscriminatory treatment, and would, for example, have included under the release provision eligible veterans of the Waterloo, Iowa, Organized Marine Corps Reserve unit. When the chairman of the Armed Services Committee made it plain he would not accept that amendment, and it was clear it would be defeated if brought to a vote, I had no alternative but to introduce a substitute which at least prevents the



President from jerking back into service again for light and transient reasons those reservists now qualified for release.

I regret the Committee has failed once again to give all reservists the consideration to which they are entitled, choosing instead to make fish of some and fowl of others.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is this not the same amendment that the gentleman offered to the Barden bill yesterday?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly so.

Mr. COLE of New York. And it was accepted by the committee?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly so.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. Since he is anxious to finish the bill tonight, why not accept the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. VINSON. We accept the gentleman's amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 33, after the period in line 8, insert the following: "Said paragraph (1) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'No physician or dentist who is engaged in full-time employment as such at any hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection while so engaged after he has attained the thirtieth anniversary of the date of his birth'."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will state to the gentleman from West Virginia that the same amendment he offered yesterday was adopted. We accept the amendment the gentleman now offers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOWE: Page 29, line 5, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for duty in Europe in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty unless the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its approval of the assignment for such duty of such persons so inducted."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Towe amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered sev-

eral days ago. I do not intend to take the time of the committee to make the same argument I made at that time. I think the House membership fully understands what is involved.

I would like to call to the attention of the House, however, some remarks that I believe need correction which were made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. In closing the debate in opposition to the amendment the gentleman suggested that my amendment would permit the President to send National Guard divisions, it would permit him to send reservists and it would permit him to send a lot of volunteers to Europe.

The fact of the matter is that most of those, including the person speaking, who favor this amendment do not concede that the President has the right to send large numbers of troops out of the country. Certainly it was a little unfair to place an interpretation upon my amendment which suggests that by offering it and having it adopted, if it should be adopted, I am responsible or those who vote for it are responsible for the use of that power, which by voting for this amendment we contest.

I asked the chairman to be on hand when this matter was before us so that he might make some observation, which he told me at the time he would make. I do not see him in the chamber at the moment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman from Georgia is coming into the chamber right now.

I was just going to ask if the gentleman did not agree that his amendment would not prevent the sending of volunteers?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct. However, there is a lot of difference between saying what it would prevent and what it would permit. The President assumes the power now, as I understand, to send troops. He is not getting any additional strength for his position from the amendment which I offer.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I ask my good friend, and he is my good friend and I have great respect for his judgment, if General MacArthur comes back and states that we ought to have an all-out war in China and we need 12 or 15 more divisions in Korea, would the gentleman have any objection to sending the troops to Korea?

Mr. TOWE. I would say this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I understand that we have a position to maintain in the world, but I believe the Congress of the United States ought to decide when the proposition is put before us how many troops are to go and where they are to go. A great deal of the judgment which would be put to use at that time would depend, as far as I am concerned, upon what the countries whom we are being asked to help were doing to help themselves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Since the gentleman has spoken about the sending of troops to Korea, I said in the debate 2 days ago and I say it again that if the Congress of the United States had been permitted to participate in the making of that momentous decision, as it should have been, we might well have avoided a lot of trouble, and we would not have so much disunity in the country as we have today. That is the primary consideration in this very amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Under the parliamentary situation, to make the gentleman's amendment germane he must have it applicable to those that are inducted under the bill.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman had the opportunity, he would offer his amendment to prohibit the sending of those who are in the armed services?

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman is correct; without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, exactly. I think the gentleman is hemmed in on account of the parliamentary situation. It applies only to the inductees in this bill.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. That is a parliamentary situation, but the gentleman's objective would be that no troops could go to Europe unless the President had the consent of the Congress.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, has made that clarifying statement, because in his concluding argument on this matter the other day he objected to the amendment on the ground that it would leave the President free to dispatch National Guard units or other troops as he might see fit. There was no opportunity to reply to that at the time.

But now the gentleman says that under the rules of the House the amendment must be limited to the people who would be inducted under the act.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, at this point the debate becomes a little difficult to follow. Whether or not we are to make a real effort to defend against communism in Europe as well as in Asia affects the destiny and security of 150,000,000 Americans whom we represent in this House, and yet there is incipient in what has both been said and seems to be implied that some may possibly—and I happen to feel personally that it cannot be so—vote on this proposition on the basis of a quid pro quo. I have been here some time now. I have been here

5 years, and what I have found—which includes also the gentleman who made the statement—in which I have faith is that everybody in this House—everybody—on an issue as serious and profound as this is going to vote his conviction for the best interests of the country and is going to let whatever by-gones there may be, be by-gones. I hope everybody in the little time that has elapsed and with the heat of the last moment past and gone, will just forget the whole thing. I do not think that the statement would have come from anybody who voted the other way on the previous amendment if we had lost—I do not think so. And I do not think on reflection that that reaction will come from anybody in this House on the merits of the vital amendment now before us.

We have done a lot of talking about defending anywhere we want without our hands tied behind our backs, and yet regardless of the rationalization which the chairman of the committee now implies on this particular aspect of the bill it is a fact, parliamentary situation or not, that if you pass this amendment you are only going to keep the particular troops raised under this bill out as replacements or in organized units or in any other fashion from service in Europe. All other troops which are not affected by this bill, and there are 3,500,000 of them now; all other troops are perfectly subject to assignment to Europe, subject also to the provisions of the Senate resolution on troops.

This is a very big and a very major question. It is a major question which took some weeks to debate in the country and the other body. It was the great debate. Here an effort is going to be made in the House to decide the same question in an oblique way, applicable only to the number of troops who will be concerned under this bill instead of bringing the question out on the floor here to debate the foreign policy aspects of it and then pass a resolution as did the other body in a considered and precise way.

How will it look to the people of our country and to the people of the world to put in this oblique way, with reference to a draft measure, a decision on a question of vital national policy? What incalculable effect will it have on our allies under the Atlantic Pact? Will it not seriously undermine the whole support for General Eisenhower's mission? How will it look if we suddenly decide this very great question of national policy on 20 minutes of debate after having only yesterday decided the very same question the other way?

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. Will not the gentleman agree that if the House should adopt this amendment, it would be an expression of opinion which I assume the President would recognize that the House, so far as it is concerned, does not want a land army sent to Europe without the approval of the Congress?

Mr. JAVITS. I agree to no such thing considering the circumstances under which it would have been effected.

Mr. TOWE. Would not that be the meaning of it?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe so, and this is the reason. The question is raised collaterally and not directly, we have not had hearings on it and there is no committee report, we are not having any remotely adequate debate for such a great question, and even if the amendment passed it could have only limited applicability.

Mr. TOWE. Does the gentleman feel that the President has the right to send troops all over the world without referring the matter to the Congress?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not consider such power to be untrammelled. But I say if we adopt this amendment it would have no such meaning as the gentleman intends it should.

Mr. TOWE. That is the gentleman's opinion, but of course the gentleman's opinion is not necessarily correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is perfectly true, but when one assumes to debate a question here, one is under a duty to give one's opinion in the hope that it may convince others.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is not the practical difficulty with the gentleman's position that we should do it by a joint resolution the fact that we do not have such a resolution before us, and there is no probability that we will have? I agree that that is the preferable way to handle this, but we are here faced with the issue of whether we approve of sending these troops without the consent of Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been said time and again that the House, or at least a majority of the House, can work its will on any subject, including the bringing up of a resolution. What the gentleman has said is no reason for the consideration of a grave question in a "quickie" amendment, a question which is a major issue of national and world policy just because the majority of the House is afraid, if it really wants this resolution, that it cannot get it up.

Mr. KEATING. That requires the cooperation of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JAVITS. I sincerely believe that if the Republican members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs insist that this matter shall come up before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am confident it will come up.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. I rise in support of the amendment. I am opposed, and the people that make up this Government whom we represent as their voice in this Congress are opposed, I dare say by a majority of at least 2 to 1, to allowing the President to send unlimited troops to Western Europe; or to fight all over the world; and to engage in war without the consent of the Congress.

No President should want this great responsibility and no President should be permitted to usurp the constitutional power of the Congress and be granted this authority whether he be a Democrat or a Republican.

When the Constitution was founded in 1787 the purpose of the founders was to establish a Republic based on giving the people the power through their representatives to control the destiny of this Government. One of their main purposes was to vest this power in the legislative department of the Government. They tried to see to it that the President was granted very little power.

The power to levy all taxes; the power to raise an army and military forces and finance them for the defense of our country was clearly vested in the legislative department of the Government. True, the Constitution designated the President as the Commander in Chief of our military forces. Someone had to be named as an Administrator, and naturally the administrative power over the Army was vested in the President.

The Constitution in addition gave the Congress the power to declare war. There could have been no thought of the founders of the Constitution that any Congress would seek to interpret their action as giving the Chief Executive the power to send hundreds of thousands of troops to Western Europe, or anywhere else in the world to be amalgamated and joined with other hundreds of thousands of foreign troops, for the purpose of engaging in a full-fledged war for the defense of Western Europe and the Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who has read the debates incident to the writing of the Constitution knows that one of the main purposes of that body, many of whose ancestors had left Europe to escape the tyranny and totalitarian control of the heads of Government in Europe, was to see to it that the President of the United States should be restricted to the very minimum of power in our Government.

Mr. Chairman, they had before them the history of a century of continuous European wars lasting at times from 20 to 30 years, the sacrifices of which were forced on the people by the war lords of Europe. They wanted to prevent the war making power of anyone who should become President of the United States and for that reason they limited the power of the President and vested the control of this country in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, Washington's Farewell Address when he warned the people of this Nation to keep out of the wars of Europe which he said would continue unabated in the future as they had in the past confirms the purpose of the



writers of the Constitution in their attempt to avoid the very world wars that face us today, by vesting the power to provide for the common defense of our country, to raise armies for defense, and to declare war, in the Congress of the United States.

Our military leaders and the President are not the Government. The Constitution designated the people who pay the taxes and furnish their sons and daughters to fight the wars of this country as the Government. It provided that the will of the people should be carried out by the elected Representatives.

They are demanding today by overwhelming majority as expressed by every poll taken in the Nation and by thousands of letters and telegrams to the Congress that we, their Representatives, write into this legislation a prohibition against the President sending troops to Europe to engage in war in the defense of western Europe without the consent of their Representatives, the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that the Congress take over greater control in our foreign policy because of the terrible mistakes that the administration has constantly made. The people are demanding that Congress take over greater control and we are the Representatives of the people.

We should exert that control by compelling the President, under this amendment, to abide by the Constitution.

The recent spectacle and the great tragedy to our country and the world in the President's dismissal of General MacArthur emphasizes and urges that we take such action. The fact that the dismissal of General MacArthur has been largely dictated by the British Government and the Socialistic Labor Party in power from 10 Downing Street, London, makes it incumbent upon the Congress to use all of its powers under the Constitution. Today the British Government, in much of our foreign policy, is exerting a greater influence in dictating our foreign policy under this administration than are the elected representatives of the people, the Congress of the United States.

The British Labor Government, the left-wingers, throughout the world and in this Nation, through appeasement will lose, if they have not already lost, the objectives of the war in Korea which will engulf all Asia in communism and will doubtless spread to take over the government of Japan which has cost billions of dollars to our Nation with the loss of thousands upon thousands of lives.

We have seen sacrificed on the altar of appeasement the interest of the United States Government in the Far East by removing General MacArthur who exhibited such brilliant American leadership in World War II, the war in Korea, and who by his great administrative ability and the confidence of the Japanese people, has established a stable government there. Yes, we have seen sacrificed in this tragic hour, the one man in the Far East who understands our problems there better than any other living person and who has stood as a symbol against the encroachment of communism in the Orient.

The leaders in Britain are elated. The Kremlin is jubilant, and their publicity stooge, the Communist Daily Worker, of New York, has published in glaring headlines the commendation of the removal of this foe of communism, General MacArthur.

This Congress should step into the breach today, follow the will of the American people and approve this amendment which would give some comfort and hope to our people whose sons are fighting and dying in Korea today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was debated the other day. I made quite an extensive speech on it then. It is in the RECORD, and a number of Members have spoken to me about it. I am glad some of them listened to it, and I hope some have read it since.

In my opinion there is no question but what this amendment should be adopted. In the first place, it is nothing more than our expression, as the other body exercised its right to bring about an expression, of this fundamental proposition, that the Congress of the United States must participate in making the great decisions that must be made for the safety and security of this country.

In the state of confusion and turmoil that exists in the country today, may I ask the Members on both sides of the aisle: Are you willing to abdicate your authority and your responsibility to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and say that we are willing to give up the power and responsibility that should be ours?

This amendment is nothing new. A parallel provision was contained in the Selective Service Act of 1940, a limitation that was written into the act to provide against sending American boys, drafted under that act, all over the world. Did anyone seriously complain about such a provision at that time? I do not recall that they did. That being true, why should we be so disturbed about this matter? If we are to permit the President to send great numbers of American troops to Europe without congressional authority, we may well be rendering academic the power of Congress to declare war. Day by day the representatives of the people of the United States are being euchred into impotence, because wars today culminate in shooting after step-by-step processes, in which the Congress takes no part.

It was precisely because the matter of troop deployment is so closely aligned with the power to declare war that the Congress was given ironclad assurance by the administration during the Senate debate on this proposed Atlantic Pact arrangement, and during the hearings, that acceptance of the treaty would in no way commit this country to the sending of troops abroad. Now the administration is asking us to do the very thing that they said they would not ask us to do.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts who made a splendid point in this connection the other day.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that under article 3 of the Atlantic union, to which this amendment is limited, that the boys who are sent overseas will be placed under the command of an individual who today happens to be General Eisenhower, but who tomorrow may be some other commander of some other nation, and will no longer remain under the Commander in Chief of the United States?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is correct. Those who assert the right to send these troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact under the power of the President as Commander in Chief, ought to recognize that when they arrive in Europe, as the gentleman from Massachusetts points out, they are not under the command of the Commander in Chief of the United States of America. They are under the command of the Supreme Commander of the Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. HERTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. And further is it not true that in order to implement article 3 of the joint Atlantic Treaty it was necessary for the Congress to take action and design legislation in order to get munitions of war and equipment overseas? Why should it not be equally applicable in sending the boys over there?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is exactly right; and may I point out and ask whether in taking a move which might plunge our Nation into the darkness of death and destruction the power should be vested in one single man? Is it conceivable that they expected the Congress to exercise no authority in that twilight zone between peace and war?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized.

Mr. GAVIN. I just wanted to tell my good and able friend from Indiana that I agree with him; I think the Congress of the United States has the right and should have the opportunity to participate in the determination of our foreign policy. Certainly you are right but you have a situation now where you are not being given that opportunity, and now you want to pass legislation which has no bearing on that matter merely in my opinion confuses the issue, because we—I think the gentleman will agree with me—are in the Atlantic Pact whether we like it or not, and, therefore, in view of the fact that we are in and pledged to go to the assistance of any country that may be attacked by Russia—it is already an agreement and there is not much we can do about it now.

We have had a situation develop in Korea where General MacArthur is concerned, and we are gravely concerned because he had been "United Nationalized," he had been hog-tied, he had been shackled and not permitted to operate with any degree of military freedom.

So now that we have accepted the Atlantic Pact and the Members of Congress have voted not with my vote for the MDP appropriations to implement the Atlantic Pact we are in. We send General Eisenhower to Europe. We believe in him; we think he is a practical,

sound, clear-thinking American. He told us that he was going over there to look the situation over and make an effort to build up the military strength of European countries in the Atlantic Pact. However, before the general commences to develop the program we start to debate on troops to Europe and whether or not we are going to cooperate. I am certain that no Member of this House wants to hog-tie or shackle General Eisenhower. If we believe in him and believe he is the kind of American who should represent us, we should stand back of him, we should have faith in him, we should have confidence in him to do the right thing; if after a reasonable length of time he does not secure results and the Atlantic Pact countries are not cooperating, we should ask him to come back home and tell us the story. But we are considering legislation that will restrict him, which will cause the people of the Atlantic Pact countries to feel that they cannot have any faith in the Atlantic Pact agreement and we are not going to stand with them in the critical hour.

Now, I want to say if we do not have confidence and faith in General Eisenhower, certainly we should call him back home, pull our troops out of Europe, get out and stay out and let them go it alone.

Before I yield I want to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for whom I have great admiration, who yesterday voted against the Towe amendment, why he changed his mind in the last few minutes.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman want me to take the floor?

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman is such a courageous man and so honest in his convictions. In view of the fact that you voted against the Towe amendment yesterday I am asking—

Mr. COX. Let me settle that question for myself.

Mr. GAVIN. That is perfectly all right; the gentleman has that privilege.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I shall be pleased to yield to my good friend from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Reference has been made to the statement made by the Chairman of the Committee in the closing of the debate in respect to the exclusion of other people. I know a lot of Members here who had been persuaded by that argument that he raised, that such a provision could not really be applicable because an amendment to be germane must go only to the people inducted.

Mr. GAVIN. Permit me to go on a bit further.

The arguments you propound here today I think should have been propounded in 1946 when you had devastation and destruction in Europe when the continent of Europe was a wreck. But since 1946 you have pumped twenty-two thousand million dollars of the American taxpayers' money into the economy of Europe not with my vote to rehabilitate the economic and industrial life of Europe. It is now a going concern. Stalin & Co. would like to take it over. Pick off the European countries one at a time and make them satellites of Russia.

What is the prize today? It is Europe not Asia. We fought our way in. We are dug in now and we should stay. We should support General Eisenhower as long as we sent him over there to the fullest extent of our ability and within reason in order to build a military defense program in the Atlantic Pact countries. It is our last fighting chance. Weaken, and Stalin & Co. moves in and you will have plenty of trouble to iron out later on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Towe amendment because it preserves to Congress its constitutional power of declaring war.

To give to the President unlimited power to send troops beyond the borders of the United States in excess of the four divisions authorized for Europe would be to give him power to get us into war without the action of Congress.

The President already has us in a sizable war in Korea. We know now from experience that he may well involve us in a war in Europe without action by Congress.

This amendment relates to the basis of our form of government. To give to the President this unlimited power is tantamount to dictatorship. The amendment would prevent that dictatorship.

The overwhelming majority of the people of America prefer that Congress should pass on the question of additional troops to Europe. They do not want dictatorship.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a closing statement?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. After we are dug in, if we pull out of Europe it will be like pulling out of Korea. You will turn it over to Joe Stalin; he will solidify his strength over there and in a year from now you will wish you had not done so.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust we will pass on this amendment based upon its merits. I have been unable to understand how a vote on this amendment should be controlled by a vote on any other amendment which is in no wise related to the pending one.

This is, of course, one of the great constitutional questions before the country today. I fully appreciate the fact that men equally well-informed on the provisions of the Constitution come to opposite conclusions with reference to it.

This is an indirect approach, and admittedly so. I agree thoroughly with what has been said as to the parliamen-

tary situation in not permitting the amendment to go further than those persons inducted under the provisions of this act; nevertheless, the situation is that the amendment would constitute a restriction upon the use of only such members of the Armed Forces as may come into the service under the provisions of this act. That is the situation, even though it is the result of a parliamentary difficulty that controls the gentleman from New Jersey.

So that the situation is that all those persons already in the service and all who come into the service by any means except through induction under this act would not be subject to the limitation. Any National Guard organization hereafter called or any Reserves hereafter activated would not be subject to this limitation.

The gentleman from Indiana referred to the 1940 act. Many of us remember the provisions of that act very well. It provided that persons inducted under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act could not be assigned at any point outside the Western Hemisphere, so that those persons who came into the service by any manner except under the Selective Training and Service Act were not subject to the limitation. What happened? In a matter of a very few months we found it necessary to remove that restriction because those who came into the service under the Selective Training and Service Act were implemented into organizations already existing, National Guard, Regular divisions, and what-not, and when it was sought to deploy an organization to any point outside the Western Hemisphere the administrative difficulty became impossible. You had to stop and screen out of the organization everybody who had come in, so that you destroyed the organization on the eve of its sailing.

You will do here exactly what developed under the 1940 act if you restrict the persons who come in now and they are not going to be assigned to any segregated unit. They are going to be integrated into already existing units. Then you are going to have the situation that you cannot use any of these units until you have screened out of them the men who come under the provisions of this act.

I submit that a great constitutional question ought not be decided in this way. The other body took weeks of debate and discussion before it ever came to its conclusion. This resolution is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That is the proper way to decide it; decide it straight out on the basis of the resolution and not come in and handicap the military forces in the use of the troops which it has by placing into existing organizations men whom you cannot use in the same manner as you can use the other men in that organization. You are disrupting and handicapping all of our armed services.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman explain the stigma that will follow



the individual taken from his organization? Then also, what effect it is going to have on morale?

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, it disrupts the morale; it disrupts every portion of the command that is trained as a team, that has been trained to fight together. Let us not handicap the morale or endeavor to decide a great constitutional question in 20 minutes on a collateral issue.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York to the amendment offered by Mr. TOWE: Strike out "persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title" and insert "members of the Armed Forces."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLE of New York. No, Mr. Chairman. I am ready to abide by the Chair's decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. TOWE.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 158, noes 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close not later than 5 o'clock.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How many amendments are there at the clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that there are about 20 amendments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close not later than 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. HALLECK.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 164, noes 94.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to make a statement. The following Members were listed as standing at the time the motion was made to limit debate. The Chair would feel it would only be fair to require any Member requesting time to state that he was stand-

ing at that time. Messrs. CASE, VINSON, ROGERS of Florida, TEAGUE, HOEVEN, SADLAK, MILLER of Nebraska, FORD, COLE of New York, PRICE, STAGGERS, YORTY, HEFFERNAN, REES of Kansas, JENSEN, JAVITS, HALLECK, HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., STEFAN, BUSBEY, POWELL, MACHROWICZ, BRAY, KEATING, MEADER, LARCADE, HINSHAW, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. VURSELL.

Can any other Member state that he was standing at the time whose name does not appear on this list?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. A number of us have amendments at the desk. Will those who have amendments be given preference in addressing the House under this limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to state that it will be the purpose of the Chair to try to recognize Members having amendments on the desk. Members of the Committee, of course, are entitled to prior recognition, but as far as the Chair is able to do so, the Chair is going to recognize Members already having amendments at the desk.

The Chair is advised that there will be about 3 minutes for each of those listed.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Page 52, following line 14, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. The active duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the Reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of 4,000,000 persons at any one time."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this amendment places an over-all ceiling of 4,000,000 persons in our Military Establishment at any one time. Historically the Congress has always controlled the Military Establishment by imposing a ceiling upon the over-all strength, which has never been removed at any time except during wartime.

When the military people came before the committee in support of this bill originally, they asked for 3,200,000. When the figures indicated that their request for the lower draft age could not be justified upon the basis of 3,200,000 it was raised to a total of 3,500,000.

Subsequently in discussing this problem the chairman of the committee suggested that a limitation of 3,500,000 perhaps might circumscribe the effective operation of the military and suggested a figure of 4,000,000. By that statement I do not mean that he approved the ceiling of 4,000,000; at any rate, that is the genesis of arriving at the figure 4,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. They justified the size of the first request which was 3,200,000; now they have an 800,000 cushion. I think that is ample.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is true. The last ceiling that the Congress imposed upon our military forces was 1,200,000. That was removed during the early part of the Korean affair, a year ago.

It is now proposed to reinstate the historic practice of Congress to control its Armies, Navies, and Air Force by imposing an over-all ceiling on the total strength.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if the situation warrants it Congress is always here and will correct the situation?

Mr. COLE of New York. The proof of that is what happened last June when the Korean affair broke out; the ceiling was removed completely and overnight.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps the most important amendment to be offered to the whole bill; at least I consider it to be such.

The psychological effect throughout the world today should the gentleman's amendment be adopted would be bad. It would say to all the nations on earth that the great Republic of America has reached the decision that it will only have an armed services of 4,000,000 men to defend its liberties. It is terrible.

No living man knows what tomorrow will bring forth. The Joint Chiefs of Staff say that for the time being three and a half million men will suffice, but tomorrow or next month, with the world in the precarious situation it is in today, they will probably have to ask for more. Of course, you can say, "We will be here." But you have to make plans before you begin to bring 500,000 men into the service. You cannot tell what we may face, you cannot tell what is in front of us, the Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot say that three and a half million men in the armed services will be sufficient. Of course, the Congress cannot say. Suppose conditions get bad? Then you would be right back here asking that four, four and a half, or five million men be brought into the services.

What is the psychological effect? What will Europe say? What will the world say? It will say that America makes the statement that she only needs 4,000,000 men. It would be bad.

The thing to do is to leave it discretionary with the Department. If it were peacetime I would say "Yes," I would be for it, because we should establish a limit in peacetime. But we are not at peace today. The world is on fire. Men are dying in Korea. Think about the boys fighting in Korea. Should they read in the papers that we will only have an Army of so many million men, they would tell us, "We need a little help."

We do not know how many we will need. This would be the worst amendment that could be written in this bill. The psychological effect throughout the world will be bad and, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may have written that provision in there, our com-

mittee debated the matter, our committee rejected it, and I certainly hope this Committee now will reject the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of New York) there were—ayes 89, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS, of Florida: Page 37, strike out lines 5 through 9 and insert the following:

"(1) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which program shall include (A) the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps, and (B) measures for utilizing the existing plants and facilities of schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable in providing initial military training (along with academic training where appropriate) for members of the National Security Training Corps."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. This amendment merely permits the commission to consider that in its plan when it submits it to the Congress.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. We accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state for the information of the Armed Services Committee and the membership of the House that this is a friendly amendment and, in my opinion, is a constructive amendment.

The over-all effect of this amendment is that it authorizes and instructs the members of the Commission to include in their recommendations, which must be filed within 6 months, to the Congress measures or a program for utilizing the existing plants and facilities of schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable in providing initial military training—along with academic training where appropriate—for members of the national security training program. This amendment would impose upon the Commission the responsibility and duty of exploring the facilities of the colleges and universities and reporting as to the advisability and feasibility of using such colleges and universities as may be deemed advisable in giving military training to the youth of this country who are called into service under the provision of this bill, and who become members of the National Security Training Corps. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in explaining the provisions of the committee amendment on page 37 of S. 1, said:

And then we enumerate and set out certain facts that the Commission must necessarily send up to the Congress for its consideration.

I am sure that under the provision of my amendment that the Commission will make a full and complete study of the colleges and universities and make a recommendation as to how they will fit into a universal military training program, for certainly such a program would be in the best interest and for the welfare of our youth to be trained in established colleges and universities rather than in camps and barracks.

I wish to call attention to the Members of Congress the fact there are 1,930 colleges and universities in the country which have from twenty to twenty-five billion dollars' worth of buildings and equipment and a large number of these colleges can immediately adopt a program of military training. The colleges and universities are in a better position to adapt themselves than any other organization.

In the utilization of the facilities of the existing colleges and universities there would be a great saving of money, and critical materials to build other plants and camps, and so forth, would be saved and speed would be advanced in that time would be saved in building other facilities to accommodate a universal military training program.

There is nothing new or involved about concurrent military training and education. The establishment of ROTC, NROTC in the senior level and ROTC at the junior level and high school is sound evidence for the reasonableness of the program being carried out by the colleges and universities. It is a cooperative endeavor between the schools and colleges and the Armed Forces. In addition to saving the taxpayers millions of dollars in constructing new plants and facilities, it would keep up the collegiate institutions instead of crippling or letting them fold up; it would save for American civilization many educational institutions which are greatly needed to preserve and promote the way of life of a free society for which we are fighting.

I introduced H. R. 2563 on February 12, 1951, which has been referred to the Armed Services Committee. This bill would have authorized the Secretary of Defense to establish a Students' Armed Forces Training Corps and thereby using the facilities of the existing colleges and universities for the training of our young men who had been drafted and prior to being called into active service. This bill provided that draftees under the age of 19 years would be given at least 1 year of academic and military training. My amendment for the use of the colleges in the UMT program is similar to the use of the colleges as provided in this bill. I hope this amendment will be adopted and made a part of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 51, after line 23, add a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps after July 1, 1957. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps before July 1, 1957 shall, not later than January 1, 1958, be released from training in such Corps but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is clear. Under it, the basic law authorizing a military-training program would provide that any such program shall end not later than 6 years from this July. I believe we must have compulsory military training as a part of our effort to make our Armed Forces strong during this emergency. I am opposed to compulsory military training or compulsory service in peacetime. I believe that at the end of 6 years those who favor a continuation of military training should have to come forward and prove affirmatively that the emergency which now exists still continues. The basic law should indicate that we do not intend to institute compulsory military training as a permanent American institution.

It may be said that a time limit can be put into the plan when it is presented to us by the Commission or the Committee on Armed Services after it has the Commission's report. I agree that is so, but this is a matter of basic principle. It may be noted that we are now establishing certain principles by the proposed bill, that of \$30 a month for trainees and that no trainee shall be sent for training abroad. I believe that my amendment involves a far more important basic principle than either of those two matters.

I hope, as a friend of military training in this emergency but also as a friend of the American tradition against compulsory training in ordinary peacetime, that this amendment will be carried.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Do I correctly understand the time limit is 6 years under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. CASE. Six years from this July. Mr. VINSON. Six years from July, not 6 years from the time of the adoption of the plan?

Mr. CASE. No, 6 years from July; in other words, July 1, 1957.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we all want to do what is the right and proper thing. Let us try to do things in an orderly way. Here, as was said the other day, we are trying to exterminate the plan before it is born. We are trying to say it can live only 6 years, or 4 years, or whatever number of years it may be. Let us get the plan in here. We are sound in getting the plan here, and we are going to write the plan here. When we get the plan in here, then we will probably put a date on it.



But let us not go ahead and say that when the plan comes in it can have a life of only a certain period of time. When the plan comes in is the proper time to do that. I no doubt can assure the Committee that it might be a period shorter than suggested by the gentleman, or it might be a little bit longer. But the proper time to determine the life of it is when you create it, and not before it is created.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE) there were—ayes 62, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRYSON: Page 36, line 17, after "Corps", insert "including the suppression of vice, gambling, and the sale, furnishing or possession of alcoholic beverages containing over one-half of one per cent of alcohol by volume upon or in close proximity to any place or institution to which members of the National Security Training Corps may be assigned for training."

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, under date of April 3, 1951, I gave notice of my intention to offer the amendment which has just been read; and my remarks appear in the RECORD of that date on page 3222. As some evidence of the importance of this amendment, it will be observed that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] offered yesterday a somewhat similar amendment to the Barden bill, which bill, of course, was acted on adversely by the committee. Today, I have been in conference with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who proposes to offer an amendment of this subject, which, in my judgment, is far more effective than my own amendment. I hope that the gentleman from New York will have an opportunity to present his amendment; and, if he does, it is my purpose to vote for the same.

Of course it is to be regretted that due to the lateness of the hour and the limitation of time, many of you, my colleagues, who have assured me of your support will not be permitted to speak.

Under the committee bill, which I have consistently supported, we will be calling from our homes younger men than have ever been called into military service before and under requirements of longer service than have ever been exacted before. With world conditions as they are, it is entirely possible that many of these young men will be sent to distant places across the several seas; and, of course, many of them will never return. While I probably entertain more extreme views against alcoholic beverages than many of you, I am happy to observe that even those of you who indulge in the use of alcohol yourselves have expressed your interest in this important matter.

Surely the least that we can do in calling these young men into service will be to try to protect them from those

vendors of vice who have no regard for decency or humanity.

There are those who believe and it is possible that if true facts were known could establish that excessive use of alcohol might have contributed to our present chaotic plight. It cannot be denied that many, many important decisions are made here in Washington and elsewhere after cocktails have gone around. I have observed in conferences I have attended here and in foreign countries following the late war that before the business of the day is discussed, cocktails must be served. Hardly an invitation is issued here in Washington to any sort of a meeting unless it is indicated that cocktails will be served. It is a shame that here in the Capital City where not only the policies for our own country but for other countries as well are being made, more liquor is consumed than any other place in the world. The per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages here in Washington exceeds that of any other city.

The idea of throwing some protection around our men in the service is not new. Practically every bill heretofore considered by this body has had some restrictions written into it on this important subject.

Those of us who know from experience by our services in some branch of the Armed Forces know that the temptations are great.

To be sure, you cannot do much by way of improving a man's morals by legal action. You can, however, at least try to place the average home atmosphere around our younger men insofar as is possible.

I urge upon you to vote favorably upon my amendment; and, as stated above, if the gentleman from New York offers his amendment as a substitute or amendment to my amendment, I shall be pleased to support it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote the amendment down. The proper way to approach this subject is somewhat along the line of the amendment offered yesterday by the gentleman from Kansas, and probably to be offered today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The Commission will have authority to go into all these questions. This amendment provides that the Commission must adopt such rules and regulations that beverages containing over one-half of 1 percent of alcohol cannot be used. They might not be able to even get shaving lotions. Probably they will get Coca-Cola. All of these kinds of amendments should be voted down. Let the Commission submit it, and then we will write the plan later on.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BRYSON: Page 54, add a new section, as follows:

"The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations governing the sale,

consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the regulations authorized hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, let me say that every time a measure dealing with the personnel of our Armed Forces comes to the floor we are faced with this problem. Of course it is an important one. I would like to see a provision of law such as contained in my amendment made permanent. We should leave it up to the President to impose regulations with respect to the control of this problem, which we all admit is severe.

My criticism of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is that it applies only to the Training Corps and not to all camps and posts of the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. In other words, it would be permanent law.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would hope it would be permanent law.

Mr. VINSON. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is along the right line, and as far as the committee is concerned we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEVEN: Page 35, line 3, after the comma, insert "of which not more than three shall be members of the same political party, and."

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on this bill we have discussed about every possible angle but have practically forgotten about the composition of the commission itself. In the interest of conserving time, I suggest the committee accept my amendment.

Mr. VINSON. The trouble about the amendment is that we do not know to what political party the two military men may belong. If you were going to have a civilian board of five men, I would not have any objection to it, but with two military men on the commission, we do not know what their political affiliations may be.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would say to the chairman that military men, if they are good American citizens, should affiliate themselves with some political party.

Mr. VINSON. But they may have been out of the country so long that they have not had an opportunity to become affiliated.

Mr. HOEVEN. The commission proposed to be set up in this bill is perhaps the most important commission Congress will ever set up. It will deal with the lives and destinies of our young manhood and should be entirely nonpartisan. The commission not only is to propose a plan for universal military training, but will also administer it. We must see that this commission is made up of the highest caliber men possible. As long as our American system is centered around our two great political parties there is no reason why both major parties should not be represented on a commission of this kind.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I suggest that if the gentleman would revise his amendment to provide that not more than two of the civil members of the commission shall be members of any one political party, then he will avoid the difficulties raised by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield, I would further suggest to the President that at least two of them would come from the minority, because I have two such distinguished men in mind that I hope will become members of this commission. So I think it would be better not to put any limitation on this thing.

Mr. HOEVEN. I prefer to have the amendment considered in the form in which I have presented it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. If these military men do not belong to any political party then the gentleman's amendment is all right.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will vote this amendment down because it is one of those things which should be left entirely to the discretion of the President to get the best men even if all of them come from one party. What we want is outstanding Americans; and I will say that if the President selects the right type of men—

Mr. VORYS. If!

Mr. SHAFER. If!

Mr. VINSON. Yes; and he is going to do it; he is going to do it in this case. If he selects the right kind of men, then the country will get behind his program, and you will have a worth-while result. I think that the President should have a free hand in selecting his men.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOEVEN) there were—ayes 101, nays 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is recognized.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: Page 52, line 14, strike out the quotation marks and insert after line 14 the following new paragraphs:

"The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from active duty (1) of members of the inactive and volunteer Reserves whose occupation, employment, or other activity is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, and (2) of members of the inactive and volunteer Reserves whose deferment is advisable by reason of the fact that other persons are dependent upon them for support. To the maximum extent practicable, deferments of such members shall be on the same basis as deferments under section 6 (h) of this title.

"The President is authorized to create and establish in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, one or more civilian Reserve deferment appeal boards (not within the Selective Service System). Each such board shall consist of five citizens of the United States who are not members of the Armed Forces, and who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such boards shall function in the same manner and have the same powers, and the members of such boards shall receive the same compensation, as in the case of appeal boards within the Selective Service System.

"Any member of the inactive or volunteer Reserve may, if his claim for deferment is denied at the time he is ordered into the active military or naval service of the United States pursuant to the first paragraph of this section, appeal to the civilian Reserve deferment appeal board for the area within which he resides, and such board shall hear and determine his claim for deferment in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the second paragraph of this section. The decisions of such boards shall be final, except that any such decision adverse to the appellant reservist shall be subject to modification or change by the highest reviewing body of the service concerned having authority to hear and determine questions or claims with respect to the deferment from active duty of members of the inactive and volunteer Reserve components of such service."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which was debated yesterday for 15 or 20 minutes, then adopted by an overwhelming voice vote of the Committee.

It proposes to set up a civilian appeal board to which members of the inactive and volunteer Reserves can appeal, if they are dissatisfied with the treatment their appeal received from the military authorities. We all know that the manner in which inactive and volunteer reservists were treated in the last year was most unjust and inequitable. This amendment simply sets up for them the same kind of protection a draftee has when he is called into service, namely, to ask for deferment on the ground of hardship or to ask deferment on the grounds of necessity in civilian occupation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Let the Committee understand this, and it is very important. The amendment means that a reservist who is called to active duty and makes application for discharge on account of hardship may go before an appeal board. The gentleman's amendment proposes to set up 49 appeal boards, to which these people may go after the armed services has denied their application. He then has the right of appeal to a civilian board to be discharged.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right, in the same way that a draftee can appeal, and on the same ground that a draftee can appeal. The committee may say this proposal comes too late. Yesterday they said that, and then stated, "We are considering this problem and at some future time we are going to submit something to the Congress." I submit that this is the time to act on this particular proposition so that at least we can prevent further injustice to the volunteers and inactive reservists of this country.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be given further study. It sets up civilian boards in a military organization; it provides for a multiplicity of boards and it means that in time of emergency when you need your reserves quickly they will all have the right to go to civilian boards and have their cases handled. A hundred boards will be distributed throughout the United States. They will have the right of appeal to any of these boards. This arrangement will delay your mobilization in time of critical emergency. Then a lot of other things are wrong which should be studied. For instance, it refers to organized and inactive reservists.

In the new law we are working on, those terms may be abolished and you may have a different set-up entirely, so the law itself may not be applicable.

I appeal to the Members of the House to let us write a fair, workable bill that will give these reservists a reasonable opportunity to have their grievances redressed in a proper manner. It has not as yet been brought out, but we are working on a new program to be recommended to the Congress and on which we will begin work Monday morning at 10 o'clock. I make a special appeal to the members of the committee to give us an opportunity to go into these things and dispose of them as should be done. I assure you these things are receiving my most careful attention.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we discussed this matter yesterday. In all probability some changes should be made in this amendment, but we also know that the bill is going to conference and that the committee will bring the bill back without this amendment in it, in any event. It seems to me that this is a very good opportunity for the membership of the House to express to the Committee on Armed Services, and through them to the military establishment, our dissatisfaction with the method of handling the deferment of our reservists and others who are being called into active duty.



I recognize the situation parliamentarily as you do, and that the bill will come back from conference without this amendment in it. But, I think we ought to express ourselves at this time that certainly the question of deferment of involuntary Reserves should lie at home. We are proposing to set up an involuntary Reserve under this bill, of those who will be required to have 6 months of training and then go into the Reserve for 6 years involuntarily. There must be some local appeal board to which they can appeal, in the event they are suffering severe hardship by being called to active duty, in the interest of their families. The bill, I believe, will not permit that.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think the gentleman could express himself more strongly than I have already expressed myself with reference to dissatisfaction. I have already made an effort to get this thing straightened out, and I want to see it straightened out, and what I am appealing to the gentleman for is an opportunity to work it out properly.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman will have an opportunity to work it out and I trust he and his committee will do so, particularly if this amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 54 after line 9, add a new section: "Provided, further, That not more than one person may be inducted into the armed services under the provisions of this Act so long as the President of the United States retains Dean Acheson as Secretary of State."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman reserve that?

Mr. VINSON. No; I will not.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman on the point of order only.

Mr. JENSEN. The Chair will note that this is a limitation. The language of the amendment reads that not more than one person may be inducted into the armed services of the United States, and hence I contend that it is germane due to the fact that it is a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has offered an amendment which has been reported and the gentleman from Georgia has made the point of order against it on the ground that it is not germane. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the subject matter covered in the amendment is not embraced within the subject matter covered by the pending bill and would impose certain limitations and restrictions on the President of the United States not contained or referred to or mentioned in the bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order. Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, has my time been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman insists, he will be recognized, but it will be to the prejudice of other Members having amendments who probably will not get to be heard.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the time of other Members. I would like to say, however, that this is an amendment which I am sure a majority of the Members of Congress would like to have adopted, and I am also absolutely convinced that a great majority of the thinking people of America would like to see it adopted for good and sufficient reasons well known to everyone.

I am sorry the Chair has seen fit to rule my amendment not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: On page 41, line 3, after "President," strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "and provided further that until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—"

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19 unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of 19 to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as 90 days older, (ii) has not attained the age of 19, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, this is the exact wording that is in the bill which passed the other body. This amendment merely requires that local draft boards induct the available 19-year-olds before they start inducting 18-year-olds, and then they must take those 18-year-olds who are nearest their nineteenth birthday.

Mr. Chairman, there is no stronger advocate in the House of training for 18-year-olds than I am. However, there is no one in the House more violently opposed to drafting 18-year-olds into our armed services than I am.

The Defense Department gave two reasons for the necessity of drafting 18-year-olds: First, 18-year-olds were needed to build up the armed services and maintain them at the required strength; second, 18-year-olds make the best soldiers. I would like to discuss those reasons at some length.

I do not believe that the 18-year-olds are necessary at this time to build up the armed services. There are many, many other things that could be done within the present 19- to 26-year-old

draft and the present Reserve situation. I have read the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services on the present universal military service and training bill from beginning to end; and nowhere was justification shown by the Defense Department for the draft of 18-year-olds. The manpower situation, which is really the controlling factor in this matter, was not presented in a consolidated fashion so that the basic need could be shown, but was scattered piecemeal throughout the hearings. When you assemble these pieces into one picture of our manpower outlook there is no justification for drafting 18-year-olds.

What did the Defense Department have to say about the manpower situation as of October 31, 1950, the date upon which all their figures are based in the hearings? Approximately 8,000,000 men were registered under the present 19- to 26-year-old draft law, of which 2,862,969 were veterans and exempt from the draft under the law. Out of the remaining 5,100,000 available for the draft, only 460,502 had been taken into service; that is, only 1 out of every 10 eligible nonveterans from 19 to 26 years had been drafted. It was estimated by the Defense Department that only 816,214 more in that age group would be drafted in the future out of this group. Meanwhile, there are 290,000 married but childless nonveterans being deferred; 554,000 students deferred; and 35 to 50 percent of the 19- to 26-year-olds referred to the Army by selective-service boards for induction being rejected for physical and mental reasons in spite of the fact that General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, maintains that the rejection rate should not be more than approximately 22 or 23 percent.

For these and many other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anywhere near adequate use of the 19- to 26-year-old age group, presently eligible for the draft, is being made. For instance, nobody can tell me that the young men of America who are 19 to 26 have deteriorated to the point where 35 to 50 percent of them are not qualified physically or mentally for some kind of duty with our Armed Forces. Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary for Defense, testified about an experience in the last war:

I recall very keenly having to go up to Buffalo to plead with an employer to permit men to go back to jobs on machines who were rejected for mental qualifications after they had been in the services.

I would like to know what kind of machines those men were running in civilian life and yet not be mentally qualified to run some kind of a machine for one of the Armed Forces. That kind of thing is what I am talking about.

We have over 20 National Guard divisions which have not been mobilized and many Organized Reserve units left, all of which contain 19- to 26-year-olds. Why cannot these men be taken before our 18-year youngsters?

In summing up this point, I believe all this has an effect on the attitude of our 19- to 26-year-olds toward military serv-

ice. When you draft only 1 out of every 10 young men eligible for service, they are going to try to avoid service as much as possible with the thought of "why should I be the unlucky one to go when 9 of my friends and acquaintances are staying behind?" On the other hand, if you take 8 out of every 10 in the 19- to 26-year-old age group, community pressure and sentiment, personal pride, and many other factors will tend to have just the opposite effect on the average young man. He will do everything possible to try to fulfill his military duty.

I believe that the foregoing, while not an exhaustive analysis, certainly is sufficient to indicate that, contrary to the Defense Department's contention, there is no necessity for drafting 18-year-olds from the manpower point of view. To say the least, the Defense Department did not make their case and show in the hearings where this step was advisable.

Mr. Chairman, the second reason that the Defense Department gave in support of the draft of 18-year-olds was that they make the best soldiers. Mr. Chairman, I know from personal experience that this is not true. I have the greatest respect for General Marshall and General Bradley, and in most things I would not unequivocally tell them that they are wrong, but, on this one particular thing, I know they are wrong. I think any man who has had intimate experience with troops in combat will say the same thing. Recently I had a letter from a former rifle company commander of mine in World War II who has been in Korea since the beginning of that action. He stated on this question:

I agree with you on the question of the 18-year-olds. In my opinion I don't think they are physically or mentally matured enough for combat. I think, and from my experience during the past war, the man between 23 and 32 makes the best combat soldier. This might still be called a police action over here but it is still a man's war.

If you want an opinion on who is the best combat soldier, go to combat men in Korea today or those who had combat duty in the last war. You will find, as a general rule, that it is the older men who are nominated for the distinction of being the best combat soldier. And, this attitude is no accident either, Mr. Chairman, because, in the thick of battle when artillery and mortar shells are pinning you to the ground while small arms fire attempts to single you out, a man is almost like a piece of glass. You can almost see his soul; you find out everything about him. Then, you see that the problem is mental and not physical. You see that the best soldier in combat is one who, in times of extreme crisis like that, has maturity and coolness. The younger men in such situations instinctively gravitated toward the older men looking for direction, assurance, and leadership. The battle is the payoff, Mr. Chairman, not a 25-mile hike on maneuvers here in the States. Look what Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, one of our finest generals, said in his book, *Our Jungle Road to Tokyo*:

The Seventy-seventh Division troops came mostly from New England and the Metro-

politan New York area. The average age of the enlisted men was 32. Contrary to general belief, it is much easier to teach a group of serious and intelligent men to become soldiers than it is to pound discipline into a group of careless and rowdy juveniles. And they may perform better in battle when matters of judgment come up.

For that matter, the records bear out the fact that in the last war the military establishment itself did not accept persons 21 years of age or below as very responsible individuals or the best soldiers. The fact that a soldier becomes a noncommissioned officer is usually an indication that he either accepts responsibility or that the Armed Forces consider him capable of accepting responsibility and, above all, that he is a good soldier. During World War II a survey was made of men in the Army and Air Force, as of December 31, 1944, at the height of the war, by a group of civilians in cooperation with these services to try to discover something about the relationship between age and noncommissioned-officer rank. The conclusion drawn from the study published in 1949 by the Princeton University Press in volume I of the *American Soldier* was that, considering the fact that time served in the service was equal, "men of 21 and under were somewhat less likely to have become noncoms in either the AAF or the rest of the Army, than older men." I think this is pretty conclusive evidence to support my opinion on the matter.

Then, Mr. Chairman, why does the military insist on taking 18-year-olds if it is not absolutely necessary and if they do not make the best combat soldiers? I do not honestly know; I can only surmise. It does seem to me, however, that the reason they want kids instead of men is because the prevailing opinion is that youngsters are easier to manage and will not talk back. For instance, in the April 1951 edition of the *Reader's Digest*, there was an article entitled "The Making of a Leatherneck" by James Finan. This article describes life in a marine boot camp where new marines are given basic training. Throughout the article are examples of how orders are given to the trainee in order to condition him to becoming a marine:

Into the showers, skinheads. Stand at attention, you idiots. You people are a god-awful collection of stupid animals. Hit the deck, you bird-brained knuckleheads.

Now, of course, an 18-year-old will take that kind of treatment better than an older man, but, Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong with our leadership when we need to resort to that type of treatment to make a soldier, and when we only desire 18-year-olds because they will take that type of abuse. General Hershey made a statement in the hearings on the question of why they want youngsters:

I would say that in the Armed Forces and in the Navy, as I have observed them, no matter how much they talk about skill, what they want is a young, smart boy, because they can teach him much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills.

Aside from soldiering, there is nothing in our way of life that would support the whole basic idea that 18-year-olds are ready to accept the full moral, mental, and physical responsibilities which attend life in the service. Our very customs, laws, and entire social structure tend to indicate that 18 is not considered an age of maturity or responsibility in the United States. In most States an 18-year-old is not allowed to exercise the basic privilege of a responsible citizen in a democracy—that of casting a vote. In most States the laws usually consider a person as a minor until he is 21 years of age, and not capable of responsible legal action. In many, many places a youngster cannot buy beer or other alcoholics until he is 21, because he is not yet a responsible person. And so on. What is there about a military emergency that suddenly makes an 18-year-old a responsible and capable individual, when up to that time the youngster has been led to believe that he is not "dry behind the ears" by practically every social convention he encounters? Why do we not allow them to run for Congress if they are so mature? Did the committee call any 18-year-olds in to testify? Of course not, because they didn't believe they had the intelligence or maturity to say what was best. If we are going to call on the 18-year-olds to do a man's job, then why are we not giving them a man's status? Mr. Chairman, to me, it is a sin to send 18-year-olds into combat.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear that while I do oppose military service for the 18-year-old, I am, and have been for some time, a firm believer in military training for the 18-year-old when it does not disrupt his education and home life. And, lest I be misconstrued on another point: Undoubtedly, there have been 18-year-olds who have made excellent soldiers. I have personally seen some individual cases where that was true. Further, I know that many made the supreme sacrifice in World War II and are today. Far be it from me to detract from these boys one iota. However, as a general rule—and that is what we must work with—I do not believe 18-year-old service in our military forces is desirable from any point of view; common sense and our experience in World War II will substantiate this. Nor can I see that it is necessary from the point of view of our present manpower situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, we debated this rather fully during general debate. The idea of restricting the local boards on taking 18-year-olds until all 19-year-olds are exhausted looks good at the first glance, but, as was stated in general debate, it will not work, because when you go down to the local board you hit the situation where one board has exhausted its 18½-year-olds and a board adjacent to it or maybe just across the street has not, and you have the situation of 18½-year-olds going on one side of the street and only 19-year-olds on the other side of the street.



It creates tremendous confusion. We had this situation during the war with reference to married men. The local board in one city would be taking fathers while another board would still have a considerable supply of unmarried men. It creates inequality between neighbors. It creates a great deal of confusion and hard feelings. If it were to be done at all, it should be on a State-wide basis. Objections have been made to that on the ground that the inventories are not complete, and it is impossible to state which local boards would be in a position to furnish those over 18½, and then they would have to go down to that.

A similar provision is in the Senate bill. I discussed it at length in general debate, and the reasons that they will not work. I assure you our previous experience has shown that this is a sort of gimmick which, while it looks good and seems really workable to some, is nothing in the world but a troublemaker. It creates confusion. It creates hard feelings and is entirely unworkable. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. I was going to offer the same amendment had the opportunity been presented for me to do so. This amendment was adopted in the other body. Of course, there will be some problems in administration. There are many difficulties now because in some counties students and farm boys are inducted and in some counties they are deferred. The amendment is necessary because against my wish and by a narrow vote the House gives the President the right to send troops all over the world without approval by Congress. The 18-year-olds are too young for foreign service. Adopt this amendment and those in the 19- to 26-year class will be called first.

I would also like to point out that there are now a large group of men that have not yet been examined, according to the testimony. That group numbers 1,632,249 individuals who are over 19 years of age. They have not yet been examined and they are between the ages of 19 and 26. An additional number of men, 799,155, because of some physical difficulty, have not been inducted into the service.

Now the standards are going to be lowered so that some of those can be taken in. Also, I would like to point out that all of the Atlantic Pact countries that we are helping now have an age limit of 20 years, with one exception. The other body proposes 18 years, and we propose 18½ years here. Let us be honest about this thing. Of course, there are going to be some difficulties in the administration of the act, just as we are presently having trouble administering the present law, but it can be done. We ought to be reasonable about it, as long as we have 1,632,000 young men who have not been examined and who are eligible for service. This thing comes close to the heart of every American home and every American mother

and father. Let us be reasonable about taking these 18-year-olds for combat service. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas should be adopted. It is the same amendment I have on the desk. It should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. It ought to be approved.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a combat veteran wounded in World War II, who is certainly informed on this particular subject, and author of this amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, there are members of the committee who will spend their time telling you that it is a gimmick and that it will not work, but they will not take the time to tell you why they cannot get men to replace the Reserves out of the 20 guard divisions in this country. They will not tell you these figures they give you run up to June 30. They will not tell you that by July 1 another 200,000 men who have been to college and who have been deferred will be available. Not one of them will try to justify those figures, except the chairman did on the first day.

They do not need the 18-year-olds and they should not be drafted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has made a clear and effective statement. I trust his amendment will be adopted and hope it will be adopted by a good majority.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, also a wounded combat veteran in World War II, who by experience certainly has knowledge on this subject matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This amendment would provide for going back and getting those men who could not go to college because of the unreasonably high mental standards they put in before the limit was dropped to 18 years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right, that is exactly the situation. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. We ought to support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Chairman, I now want to call attention to a parliamentary situation or a maneuver that I think is entirely unfair to the membership of the House.

I am advised that when final vote comes in the House on this bill, there will be no opportunity to vote for recommitment with an amendment of any kind. I am informed this is by reason of the peculiar wording of a rule under which this legislation is submitted. This rule takes that right away from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Since I have been a Member of the House, it has been my understanding and, I believe, the understanding of almost everyone, a motion for recommitment

with an amendment is in order. This gives opportunity for a Member, if he desires to do so, to submit for vote at least one amendment considered in the Committee of the Whole. Several amendments were considered in the Committee but rejected by narrow margins. The usual rule should apply in considering this bill. Irrespective of the manner in which Members may choose to vote, the procedure of the Committee in this respect is, in my opinion, not only unusual but unfair, especially when such important legislation is under consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I would like to use the time allotted to me now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. First, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this amendment. As I understand, it is in the measure as it came from the other body, and I cannot see any reason why it should interfere with the action here contemplated.

I just want to pay my respects to those who have arisen here time after time and bemoaned the psychological effect of some amendment that might have been offered. Speaking of psychological effect, the most terrible psychological effect credited in this country in a long time resulted from the dismissal of General MacArthur. For proof of that get the Daily Worker of yesterday. Who applauded it? Not the American people, but the Communists and all of their fellow travelers. If you want to look for psychological effect, look for the psychological effect where it really belongs.

Now, I wish to make an announcement that is not apropos of that, particularly: Our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will speak on NBC, Columbia and Liberty networks at 10:30 o'clock tonight. I hope everybody will listen, even my good friends on the right. They might be enlightened.

Now, there is another matter that I wish to comment on, because this is the only opportunity I will have. For a long time rules have come out of the Rules Committee of one sort or another, designed to expedite the business of the House of Representatives. Frequently, in order to so expedite business, it is made in order to consider a committee substitute as an original bill. That does expedite consideration. Generally the rule provides that when you have a circumstance like that—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Ordinarily, as I recall those rules, special in nature, they have provided all the way through that the matter be considered as an original bill. This particular rule under which we are operating provides that this bill shall be considered as an original bill only for purposes of amendment. It is

limited to that. Now, what is the effect of that sort of rule? It is to shut off the minority from making a motion to recommit, with instructions.

I want to say, certainly with no intention of criticizing anyone unduly, or improperly, if that rule, not understood by many members of the Rules Committee may I say advisedly, because I have talked with them—if it was done inadvertently, then it should be corrected. This should be done so that a motion to recommit, with instructions—which, since time away beyond me, has been considered inviolate for the minority—should be protected. If it was, as I say, inadvertently done, it ought to be corrected and no Member should make a point of order against a motion with instructions. If it was done with malice aforethought, then it is—well, I will not say it is sharp practice, but it is pretty clever practice.

As far as the rights of the minority are concerned, it borders on the reprehensible. May I say at this point that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] tells me he did not know of the restrictive character of the rule. I would hope that when we get back into the House a point of order would not be made against a motion to recommit, with instructions. I would not like to believe that any Member of this body or any Member having this very important measure in charge actually undertook—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time to which I am entitled to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to believe that in the effort of the Rules Committee to cooperate to expedite consideration of this measure, in the action of the membership generally in going along with the rule, since it was not known—certainly it was not known to me that that particular gimmick was in there—I would like to believe that no one in the membership would make a point of order on a motion to recommit, with instructions, if one is made by someone qualified to make it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a member of the Rules Committee, when this matter was before the Rules Committee it was my understanding, and I believe the understanding of all members of the Rules Committee, that it was to be a regular rule, waiving points of order, considering the Vinson bill as an original bill, and being an open rule, as we usually treat it, so that the rights of the minority would be protected on a motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish to concur in the statement of the gentleman

from Ohio, that there was certainly no intention on the part of the Rules Committee to deprive the minority of their right to a motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN. And this rule does not do it; this rule provides that there shall be one motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; but I have checked it with the Parliamentarian. I believe we should have completed the wording of the rule by adding after the word "recommit" the words: "with or without instructions."

Mr. RANKIN. No; that is not necessary. You can get that under this rule.

Mr. HALLECK. When I read the rule I hoped that it would not be interpreted that way, but it has been so interpreted by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. RANKIN. That is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEAGUE) there were—ayes 105, noes 81.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. VINSON and Mr. TEAGUE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 158, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 28, line 14, substitute a colon for the period and add the following proviso: "Provided further, That the physical standards prescribed in the preceding proviso shall be construed so as to permit the voluntary induction of physically disabled persons for limited service in such numbers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, when such disability could not reasonably be expected to be aggravated by such service."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and I think the distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], made the best argument for it that I know. This is to relieve the manpower situation of this country. It permits the Defense Establishment to take into clerical and guard jobs veterans who may have lost an arm or a leg, but who are able to do clerical, guard, or desk work. That will relieve these other men for active service. The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, says it will interfere with the rotation problem. He knows as well as I do that the men in the combat units do not rotate in the desk jobs in the Pentagon Building. Now, we are talking about troops to Europe and more men in the armed services and drafting of 18-year-olds. This is one way of relieving that situation. There are thousands of these boys who have been maimed by losing an arm or a leg who want to serve their country. They are anxious to take the jobs and let these other men go into combat. If this amendment is adopted, I feel confident there would be sufficient man-

power so that the Congress would not have to consider drafting 18-year-old boys at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the Committee that all of these amendments are very important, and when we go to conference, of course, we have to represent the viewpoint of the House, and we will have to fight for everything put in this bill to stay in the bill. The trouble about the gentleman's amendment is this: It means that if the Army or the Defense Department can take in one-legged or one-armed men or cripples, that it simply means a limited service is being created. We are going as far as we possibly can when we reach down to the standards set in January 1945. Now, the gentleman wants to go still further, so I trust that the Committee will reject this amendment because these amendments have to be defended in conference and have to carry the voice of the House if it supports these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 36, line 2, after the word "Commission", strike out the last two words on line 2 and all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "shall receive \$15,000 per annum."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I feel, as a lot of you do, that this is the most important issue that will come before the Eighty-second Congress, and when universal military training goes into effect it will alter the course of this Nation. Only history will tell whether it be for better or for worse. This commission, I feel, is the most important commission that possibly the Congress will ever appoint because it will affect the homes and the lives of every man who reaches the age of 18 or 19. I feel it should be a full-time commission and not a part-time commission that comes here and draws up some plan and then goes back home and lets the military run the program. The question was raised in committee that we could not get any good men for \$15,000. We must remember that a Congressman gets only \$15,000.

This commission is called upon to report every 6 months to Congress. It is important that it be on the job because the bill states that this commission shall direct and control all the training of the boys enrolled in UMT. Therefore, I believe the commission should be a full-time commission. If you want to get college and university presidents, the commission can get assistance from the college and university presidents to help them draw up the plan and give any advice they might need.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if you follow out the suggestion of the gentleman from West Virginia you just create a \$15,000 job for some politician who did not receive sufficient votes to get back to the House or the Senate. Let us not create those



jobs for anybody, but let us do a worthwhile job here by having an outstanding Commission that is not dependent upon this salary. That is the reason we put it as we did, at \$50 a day for the days they work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD:

Page 52, strike out lines 15 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The first section of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States,' approved July 27, 1950, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'That until July 1, 1952, the President shall be authorized to extend all enlistments in any branch of the Armed Forces for 12 months, except enlistments of persons who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive. *Provided:* That all persons whose terms of enlistment are extended in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall continue during such extensions to be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the Government of their respective services. No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act. Any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve now or hereafter ordered to active duty who served for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between September 16, 1940 and June 24, 1948, whose enlistment has been extended pursuant to this Act prior to the date of the enactment of this amendatory section shall within 3 months following the date of enactment of such amendatory section be discharged upon application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of the service in which he is serving.'"

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does two things. First, it states that there shall be no authority to extend involuntarily enlistments of those men who served for 1 year or more in any branch of the armed services during World War II. Second, it provides that those inactive and volunteer reservists who have already had their enlistments extended involuntarily and who are on active duty at the present time as a result of recall to active duty can be discharged within 3 months after they make application to the Secretary of their respective branch of the Armed Forces.

All of us know that the men who are in the Reserves have a contract for a definite period of years. Under legislation the Congress enacted last year in the emergency we said the President for 1 year could involuntarily extend any enlistment.

My amendment says only this. The man who served for 12 months in World War II cannot have his enlistment extended involuntarily. It further provides that those who have had their enlistments extended and who are now on active duty can be discharged at their own

request within 3 months after the passage of this legislation.

I want my Government to live up to its contracts except where there is a declaration of war by Congress. The United States, your Government and mine, should abide by its agreements. Where there is the unlimited authority to involuntarily extend enlistments the Government does not keep its word. My amendment to a large degree corrects this situation. I hope for the benefit of our veterans and their families, that my amendment is approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the committee had a chance to understand this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, I am satisfied it would not receive the support which he has asked the committee to give to the amendment. The effect of the amendment, which he was kind enough to give to us so that we might examine it, is that a man who has served 12 months in World War II could not have his enlistment extended beyond the time when it expires, for 12 months. It would apply to Reserves and Regulars.

You see what you are getting into here, it would have the effect of immediately authorizing the discharging of some 60,000 people, most of them well-trained personnel and many of them noncommissioned officers. This is too critical a proposition to be dealt with by amendments in this manner. We worked for months and months and months with experts on this bill and I think the committee knows what it has done. I do not think the amendment offered by the gentleman will help the bill. All of these amendments are very destructive to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 41, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: On page 34, before the period in line 25, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the National Security Training Commission established by paragraph 3 of this subsection may provide that the initial military training of any individual or group of individuals inducted into such corps shall be accomplished during two periods of 3 months each in successive years, rather than during one period of 6 months."

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, this is a friendly amendment. It is a permissive amendment. It merely provides that when the National Security Training Commission presents to Congress a plan that it may provide for the division of the 6 months' basic training period into two periods of 3 months each in successive years. This would enable a boy, upon his graduation from high school, to take his 12 weeks of basic training in the summer following his graduation from high school; then go to college and finish his training the

summer after he completes his freshman year in college. Therefore, he would be able to get a 6 months' basic training without the interruption of his schooling in any manner whatsoever.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Of course the Commission would have the authority to deal with that question when it submitted the report. But if you place it in the bill the Commission might interpret it as a mandate to follow what is written in the bill.

Mr. LANTAFF. I disagree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question which the gentleman asked me, that is not true, because this is a permissive amendment. The amendment says "may". Under the bill as drafted it "requires" that the training period be six successive months. My amendment is merely permissive.

Mr. VINSON. The Commission will consider all of these things written on page 37 as congressional intent. That is the trouble. It proposes 3 months' training in 1 year, 3 months the next year, and so on. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANTAFF), there were—ayes 59, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 35, strike out line 1 and all that follows down through line 2 on page 37, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on National Security Training (hereinafter referred to as the 'committee'), to be composed of five Members of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to perform the functions of the committee, and any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(4) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (7) of this subsection, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or vice chairman.

"(5) The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the functions vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

"(6) The committee shall have power to appoint, without regard to civil-service laws, and to fix the compensation, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such experts, consultants, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives from the contingent fund of the House, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that the plan or statutory basis for universal military training will be written by a joint committee of the Congress, rather than by a commission appointed by the President. The joint committee thereby created would have full leeway in the employment of experts and staff personnel, without regard to civil-service laws, and without regard to limitations upon salary.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has expressed the hope that the five members of the Commission provided by S. 1 will be top-flight men and has said that he has some names in mind. If my amendment carries, he would not need to beg the President to appoint such men. He could have a great deal to do with it himself since he would undoubtedly be a member of that joint committee.

Formulating a universal military training plan by a congressional committee would preserve the constitutional principle that laws should be written here in the Congress, where our constituents expect them to be written, and would avoid turning over to a Presidentially appointed commission the authority to write laws in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER) there were—ayes 114, noes 153.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this bill. Why? Because we are at war. We are at war, where American blood flows more freely than in the first bloody year of World War II, engaged in war because of the

stupidity of the President and the chicanery of his Secretary of State.

The stupidity of which I speak was compounded in the President's recent radio address when he asserted that real peace can be achieved: First, if the fighting stops; second, if it does not break out again; third, if aggression ends. In other words, we shall have peace if we do not have war. Such a conclusion is worthy of the powers of ratiocination of our lamentable Commander in Chief.

"The Communist side must now choose its course of action," said the President in his radio apology to the American people. This is a clear admission that the President has no ideas of his own about how to get peace, that he has surrendered the initiative. Since the President's admission means that what happens next is Stalin's choice, we had better get prepared, we had better have this legislation.

The picture of a President without a plan as opposed to the clear cut objectives of the aggressive, militant Communist enemy, is a hard dose for the American people to swallow. Is it any wonder that the Communist Party in America, through Eugene Dennis, and the Daily Worker, praise President Truman for his service to their cause. Is it any wonder?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment, but the Chair will state that all time for debate has been exhausted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SADLAK:  
Page 26, following the amendment offered by Mr. WALTER, insert the following: "Any citizen of a foreign country who, notwithstanding the relief from liability for training and service under this title afforded him by the preceding sentence, shall have enlisted in or shall have been inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall be eligible for full and immediate United States citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of this title."

On page 52, after line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"(y) The Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title I thereof a new section, as follows:

"NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS INDUCTED OR ENLISTED IN THE ARMED FORCES

"SEC. 22. (a) Any person not a citizen, regardless of age, who on or after June 25, 1950, and not later than June 3, 1952, has actively served or actively serves, honorably, in the Armed Forces of the United States and who, having been lawfully admitted, temporarily or otherwise, to the United States, including its outlying possessions and including the Canal Zone, shall have been at the time of his enlistment or induction within any such areas, may (notwithstanding the provisions of sections 303 and 326 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended) be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that (1) no declaration of intention and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; (2) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner; (3) the petitioner shall not be required to speak the

English language, sign the petition in his own handwriting, or meet any additional test; and (4) no fee shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certificate of naturalization, if issued: *Provided, however,* That (1) there shall be included in the petition the affidavits of at least two creditable witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each such witness personally knows the petitioner to be a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States; (2) the service of the petitioner in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be proved by affidavits, forming part of the petition, of at least two citizens of the United States, members of the Armed Forces of the United States of the noncommissioned or warrant officer grade or higher (who may also be the witnesses described in clause 1 of this proviso), or by a duly authenticated copy of the record of the executive department having custody, of the record of petitioner's service, showing that the petitioner is or was during the period hereinbefore described a member serving honorably in the Armed Forces; and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1952. The petitioner may be naturalized immediately if prior to the filing of his petition the petitioner and the witnesses required by the foregoing proviso shall have appeared before and been examined by a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"(b) Any person entitled to naturalization under subsection (a), who while serving is not within the jurisdiction of any naturalization court, may be naturalized in accordance with applicable provisions of subsection (a) without appearing before such court. The petition for naturalization of any such petitioner shall be made and sworn to before, and filed with, a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service designated by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, which representative is hereby authorized to receive such petition, to conduct hearings thereon, to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the admissibility of such petitioner for naturalization, to call witnesses, to administer oaths, including the oath of the petitioner and his witnesses to the petition for naturalization and the oath prescribed by section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, and to grant naturalization, and to issue certificates of naturalization: *Provided,* That the record of any proceedings hereunder together with a copy of the certificate of naturalization shall be forwarded to and filed by the clerk of a naturalization court in the district designated by the petitioner and made a part of the record of such court.

"(c) Any person otherwise qualified for naturalization pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), (1) who is discharged under other than honorable conditions from the Armed Forces of the United States, or is discharged therefrom on account of his alienage, or (2) any conscientious objector who performs or performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, shall not be entitled to the benefits of such subsections (a) or (b): *Provided,* That naturalization granted pursuant to subsections (a) or (b) may be revoked in accordance with such section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, if at any time subsequent to naturalization the person is separated from the Armed Forces of the United States under other than honorable conditions, and such grounds for revocation shall be in addition to any other provided by law. The fact that the naturalized person was separated from the service under other than honorable conditions may be proved by a duly authenticated certificate



from the executive department under which the person was serving at the time of separation and such department shall supply such certification."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, how much time will be allotted to me for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the discretion of the Chair. The gentleman's argument must be confined to the point of order. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that a time limitation has been fixed, and not because of any inattention on my part, I shall not have time to present my amendment and the reasons for adopting it.

May I say that the policy which I desire to have added to this bill is not a new one. It was a policy which was inaugurated during World Wars I and II and provided for the expeditious naturalization of noncitizens who served in the armed services of the United States. When I began working on this amendment this morning, Mr. Chairman, I was of the opinion that it only concerned a limited number of noncitizens. Originally, this matter was brought to my attention because of two Polish boys in my district who enlisted and are now fighting in Korea and who must wait 5 years before they become United States citizens. I learned just about an hour ago that there are not a half dozen noncitizens in the uniform of the United States but 73,546 noncitizens presently in the United States Army.

Under the provisions of S. 1 aliens who are legally here in the United States will be more readily inductible into the armed services than heretofore because of the provisions that have been added to the original measure. Since we are bringing them into service under the bill and because many will continue to come within the provisions of this act voluntarily by enlistment, I feel my amendment has positive germaneness since it is directly concerned with those actively engaged in the common defense and security of the United States as is this title of S. 1.

I am not interested in making each of the noncitizen soldiers and sailors a captain, general or admiral but I do want to make it possible to have the technical skill of each utilized to the fullest extent in their respective services and such is prohibited because they are not citizens of the country in whose uniform they are now serving or may serve. During World War II, the Second War Powers Act—March 27, 1942—permitted all aliens who were serving, or had served, honorably in the United States Armed Forces to apply for full and immediate citizenship. After the war,

this naturalization section of the Second War Powers Act was replaced by a new naturalization act which gave even more complete coverage. On June 1, 1948, Public Law 567 in which I had a part, granted full citizenship on application to all aliens who had served honorably in the United States Armed Forces during the First World War—April 6, 1917–November 11, 1918—and during the Second World War—September 1, 1939–December 31, 1946.

Since hostilities broke out in Korea, in June 1950, the draft laws have again come into operation, we are further extending them today, but to date no short-term naturalization has been made available to noncitizens serving under them. Aliens have donned our uniforms but they do not have the constitutional protection their United States uniform should afford. If they are captured, and such is not a remote possibility since many are engaged in Korea, they are destined to certain liquidation or release behind the lines to Soviet Communists as might readily be the case with the two boys of Polish birth in Poland on whom they would like to get their hands on since they were active in the Polish underground forces prior to their escape. American citizenship to them would give them a better chance of being saved and would lessen the great concern of their parents and loved ones who are here in the United States.

During the last war Immigration and Naturalization Service personnel travelled over the globe wherever our troops were serving and administered the oath and bestowed United States citizenship to the noncitizen troops serving and dying for this Nation. Many became citizens just prior to being assigned to overseas duty. No provisions today make the same process possible though my bill in the last Congress H. R. 9438 introduced August 15, 1950, and H. R. 371 introduced by me on January 3, 1951, would again grant this privilege. I ask the members to study H. R. 371 which in effect is my amendment of today and to give me some assistance with it on the legislative highway in the event the chairman sustains the point of order raised against it at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment and I insist on its germaneness to the present bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Connecticut has offered an amendment and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has made a point of order against it on the ground it is not germane to the pending bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment as carefully as possible within the time available. It appears clearly that the scope of the amendment is beyond the scope covered by the pending bill and, therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Chairman, I deem it necessary to vote against the pending universal military training and service bill as a vigorous protest on behalf of the people I have the honor to represent in the Congress against granting more and more power to an administration bankrupt in leadership, in policy, and in results.

I yield to none in my devotion to sound and adequate national defense. The people I represent share that devotion.

But the present bill is a hopeless hodgepodge of confusion embodying a shotgun merging of present needs with future possibilities. It represents an effort to write as yet undetermined policy regarding eventual universal military training into legislation which ought to be concerned immediately and primarily with the overwhelming needs of the present hour. It refuses to recognize the necessity for doing first things first, with resultant weakening of our capacity to meet the grave threats facing us in the months and years ahead.

Moreover, every attempt of a militant minority to improve the bill by amendment has been frustrated by administration forces in solid control of the majority of this House. How else, then, may we express the opposition felt by our people at home except to vote against the bill as it is now before us?

In its present and final form, this measure which is so vital to the preservation of our security abandons the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to declare war for it fails to provide consultation with the Congress on the use of American troops, in peacetime, in Europe or elsewhere around the world. This bill, in its present and final form, fails to accept the responsibility of the Congress for formulating the proposed program of universal military training contemplated to follow the draft and leaves this controversial task to a presidential commission. The bill, in its present and final form, fails to set a terminal date which would guarantee congressional reexamination of the question in the light of future conditions.

Mr. Chairman, these are but a few of the obvious and more important shortcomings in the measure driven through the Congress by an administration in which vast numbers of indignant citizens no longer share any confidence. I know full well, at this late hour, that this measure will pass by an overwhelming vote because so many of my colleagues feel some portions of it are essential to our survival. But I cannot do so. In good conscience, and in full confidence that there is a better way, I must vote against the pending bill to keep faith with our people who want to raise a voice of protest against an administration that is squandering our military resources in human strength with the same abandon it has shown in dissipating our economic resources.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the most vital of our democratic traditions has been that which stresses the distinctly civilian character of our Government—the concept that the military branches are no more than arms of a supreme civil administration. In keeping with that tradition I have always

personally opposed tendencies toward militarization and military dominance. Much of my career in Congress has been devoted to fighting against specific instances of military encroachment on what I consider to be distinctly civilian spheres of operation, and I am keenly aware that the present emergency and the mobilization program have multiplied the opportunities for such encroachments—small businesses have suffered from too great a voice by the military in defense contracting and allocations of scarce materials before the real need has been analyzed by congressional or other civilian bodies—the Navy has moved too far into the field of ocean transportation of goods and supplies as well as personnel—many policy controlling jobs in the over-all defense effort have been given to men with military backgrounds and military minds. I am strongly opposed to the tendencies which those factors signify, and I shall continue to seek to limit the expansion of military control which they promote.

However, the Korean emergency has set a spark to a fire which has been kindling since the end of World War II. We are now facing a situation which requires that we reexamine our policies in the light of world events and the foreseeable future. I have gone through that process of reexamination, and it has not been easy. The thought of a system of universal military training has always been obnoxious to me as a violation of the traditions which I have just mentioned. But we are now confronting a future of crisis after crisis, deliberately created to test our strength and will. Unless we resolutely demonstrate that we are prepared to meet those crises—to fight the fire of communism with a stronger fire of our own—I am forced reluctantly to conclude that we will be consumed. Unless we exhibit to the world a determination to stop at no sacrifice to preserve the principles upon which we stand, the rest of the democratic world, which now looks to us for leadership, will falter and be lost to us. We cannot stand alone. We must demonstrate our firmness of intention to our friends as well as to our potential enemies. The institution of a system of organized military training for all the youth of our Nation at this time, will, I am now convinced, have a tremendous psychological impact upon the rest of the world. It will, as well, fulfill a real need in preparing us for what may become a world conflict.

The psychology of the Kremlin has been to alternate periods of seeming conciliation with periods of aggressive action. If this psychological warfare is continued there will be times when we do not need in our active standing armies a heavy complement of men. Yet, the Soviet may choose just such a time in which to strike. For that reason, I believe that we must have available, perhaps for years to come, a force of trained men to throw into action with little preliminary training or indoctrination. The National Security Training Corps, for which the bill we are now considering provides, will give us that force. I am, therefore, prepared to vote for these provisions with reservations.

In connection with the crying need for unified action by the United States as a demonstration of our fitness to lead the fight against communistic imperialism, I feel impelled to comment on the distressing contrast evident in the Houses of Congress between the spirit shown immediately after the outbreak of the Korean war and that which is apparent today. That contrast is making itself felt throughout the United States and throughout the world. It does not bode well for the future of democracy—it may indeed spell national suicide. At the end of June 1950 when the United States and the United Nations had committed themselves to the defense of the Republic of South Korea—and in a larger sense to the defense of democratic principles throughout the world—there was a tremendous wave of enthusiasm on both sides of this House. There was serious and apparently sincere determination to support that action to whatever extent necessary. However, the entry of the Chinese Reds, the December defeats, and, let us be frank, some of the mistakes which have been made, have dimmed that enthusiasm. There has been in some quarters a regrettable attempt to make political capital of the mistakes and to make a political football of the entire problem of the emergency situation and its administration. The military manpower problem and the question of the prerogatives of the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, have been used to further the political ambitions of individuals, and to create disunity as to the United States' part in the world struggle. I repeat that I am opposed to making the military paramount over the civilian arm of our Government, but I am equally opposed to political maneuverings at a time when we are engaged in a life-or-death battle. Just as I shall oppose the overweening ambitions of some elements in military circles, so shall I oppose the placing of hamstringing restrictions on the justified and recognized prerogatives of the Armed Forces and their Commander in Chief.

Because of those considerations I shall oppose inclusion in any bill which this House may pass of provisions such as that now contained in the Senate bill to place a numerical limitation on the total strength of our Armed Forces. We are not now engaged in a game of tidiedly winks—we are in a cold war. A limitation of troops to 4,000,000 or to any similar number will be accepted by the world as a limitation on the extent to which we are prepared to defend ourselves and to help in the defense of the democratic world. In this situation we should not place hobbles on the Defense Department's ability to best utilize the full resources of the country. We should not place arbitrary restrictions on their ability to plan and to make recommendations to Congress for the moneys needed to carry out the planning which is their proper function. If in any given situation the Congress feels the need for some measure of control over the size of our forces, adequate means are provided in the congressional power to appropriate and specify the purposes to which appropriations shall

be put. An arbitrary limitation now would serve no useful purpose and would only weaken our position in the eyes of the world—all as a sop to political motives. We are engaged in a psychological war with communism and such a limitation would be a psychological victory for our enemies.

I have stated that I will support the universal military training provisions of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act now under consideration with reservations. My primary reservation is directed at the fact that no termination date has been set for the universal military training provisions of the act. To me the inevitable result of whole generations of young men trained in military thinking, and imbued with the military tendency to pursue ends without a scrupulous regard for the civilian economy and our democratic traditions, would be a nation dedicated to militarism and possibly controlled by a military dictatorship—just the type of control we are now fighting against. I do not favor permanent universal military training. I believe it to be a present necessity but a possible future danger. For that reason I propose that it be made mandatory that Congress reexamine the necessity for its continuance. Once such legislation is on the books it becomes exceedingly difficult to get it off unless provision is made in the law itself for such action. I, therefore, shall propose an amendment to the present bill, or shall support amendments which may be introduced by others, to place a 6-year limitation on the National Security Training Corps provisions of the bill. Six years of universal military training, together with the provisions for service in the Reserves incorporated in the bill, should provide trained forces for a period of at least 12 to 15 years. At the end of 6 years we may, God willing, be able to see our way out of the present dismal state of affairs.

With regard to the second of my reservations, I am pleased to note that the House Committee on Armed Services has incorporated in its amendment to S. 1 a requirement that at least 4 months "full and adequate" military training before an inductee may be sent overseas, and that such an inductee may not be assigned for duty in an overseas combat area with less than 6 months service in the Armed Forces. I shall vigorously support that provision. I would not favor drafting of either 18- or 18½-year-old boys were it not included. My mail has been filled with too many complaints from parents whose sons were sent to Korea without adequate training. It seems obvious that there has been laxity and inefficiency on the part of the military in this regard. The lives of young men are too precious to their families and to their country to permit their being trifled with in this way. The use of untrained men in modern warfare is likewise inexcusable militarily. I believe that circumstances have shown the need for some safeguard against a repetition of this condition, and I shall therefore support the provision.

A further limitation on the authority of the military which is contained in the



House bill, and of which I heartily approve, is that placing a limitation on the length of service required of members of the Reserves who have seen previous service in the Armed Forces. Here again is a matter upon which the Defense Department has apparently not made the best use of opportunities available to it to minimize the distress caused civilians and their activities. It has been over 9 months since the beginning of hostilities in Korea. In that time definite policies should have been formulated with respect to service by reservists and a plan for systematically relieving them of duty in as short as possible a time should have been developed. This has not been done. I, therefore, believe that Congress should now step in and make such a provision mandatory. As long as we are not engaged in a war of greater scope than the Korean operation I see no reason why this cannot be done.

As a brake on the overmilitarization of our citizenry, and as an assurance that our educational system, particularly in our colleges and universities, shall not become moribund, I favor the provisions of the House bill, giving the President authority to defer from training and service any category or categories of students as he may deem appropriate. I believe that the provisions written into the Senate bill are too restrictive, and that the plan for inducting such students into service for preliminary training and then releasing them for a return to school would prove difficult to administer and would make for confusion. While the continuance of our civilian education programs is necessary to counterbalance excessive militarism, the changing picture with regard to military manpower needs makes flexibility of administering deferments for educational purposes necessary. The authority for providing this flexibility should properly lie with the President. However, I believe that the Congress should closely scrutinize the administration of the program to assure that the maximum numbers of students consistent with national security are permitted to complete their civilian education; and to assure that there are no abuses or cases of favoritism.

I wish to make one final point on specific provisions of the bill before us. The House Committee on Armed Services saw fit to include in their amendment a proviso in section 3 of the bill which I consider to be abhorrent to the democratic principles which we are seeking to protect. I refer to the proviso effectively requiring setting up of racially segregated units in both the National Security Training Corps and the Armed Forces. If permitted to remain in the legislation finally passed we will have undone the Defense Department's good work of the past several years in fostering equality of treatment for all races. The provision is not only obnoxious—it has been proved unnecessary by the successful fusion of racial groups in the Armed Forces since the program was originally undertaken. These men have lived and worked together without undue friction and in direct contradiction of the dire prophecies made by such groups as are sponsoring the present

proviso. That proviso will give our Communist enemies a wonderful piece of ammunition for their propaganda guns if it is permitted to remain in the bill. It should be killed. I shall, therefore, support the amendment which I understand our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is to offer to strike out that proviso.

It may be that all of the provisions which I hope to see included in the bill are not in it when it comes up for a final vote. It may be that some of the provisions which I should like to see stricken still remain. It is my present intention to vote for passage of the measure even though it may not completely satisfy me. I shall do so because I feel very strongly that the need is great. I do not wish my objections to be construed as mere obstructionism, neither do I wish their importance to be underestimated. I must, in good conscience, voice a solemn warning that the action we take on this bill may well change the whole course of history—not only for the United States but for the world. Failure to act will indicate to the world that we are not prepared to give full and unqualified support to the defense of democracy. It will leave us unprepared to meet the next aggression of the Soviet regime. It will, indeed, tempt the Kremlin into new acts of aggression. However, in acting, we must insure ourselves against falling into the pitfall of military dictatorship. Congress, by setting a termination date on the universal military training provisions of the bill, can pay the first premium on such insurance.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAY:

Page 26, line 17, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

Page 26, lines 18 and 19, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

Page 26, line 25, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

Page 27, lines 5 and 6, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this suggested amendment to the bill is very simple. It merely fixes 19 years as the minimum age of induction instead of 18½ years. Nineteen years is the minimum under the present law, and that is even lower than most of the Atlantic Pact nations. Under this present law—that is, the draft of 19-year-olds—we have filled up our Armed Forces to such an extent that the Army is now 100,000 over strength; in addition, the draft quotas are being cut drastically every month.

Then why should the age be lowered to 18½ years? In the limited time allotted to me I do not care to discuss in detail the various figures advanced by

the proponents of the 18½-year-old draft, but I doubt that anyone on this floor really believes that it is necessary to lower the draft age below 19 years in order to get the needed men for our Armed Forces. Then why this great pressure to lower the draft age?

Secretary Marshall and Mrs. Rosenberg were most confused when they attempted to juggle figures to justify their request for lowering the draft age.

The Secretary, although he said that he only desired an Army of approximately 3,500,000, objected vehemently when the Senate fixed the limit of the Armed Forces at 4,000,000. He objected bitterly when Congress attempted to prevent American troops from being sent willy-nilly over the world without the consent of Congress. Frankly, I believe that this desire to draft children is a part of this vast plan of regimentation that the administration under the direction of Secretaries Marshall and Acheson, is attempting to force upon the American people. Yes, they want 18-year-olds, not that they are better soldiers, but that they can mold and regiment their minds easier. The American brass tells you that 18-year-olds are great soldiers and have great courage. Yes, they are reckless and suffer great casualties, if that is what you want.

I was never a general, but I did serve more than 5 years during the last war, 4 years of which were spent in the Asiatic-Pacific theater. I was in the tanks and I believe that I am capable of judging the effectiveness of troops, and I can say from certain experience that, at least in the tanks, 18-year-old boys lacked the maturity to make the best soldiers. If reckless disregard of life is your goal, then the 18-year-old soldier is okay; otherwise he is not.

Then I oppose the 18-year-old draft for a much greater and more fundamental reason. These boys are the future America. I shudder to think of these boys away in the Army, away from the influence of the home, the church, and the school for 26 months. I have been interested in the youth problem for many years and I know that Army life is not for the 18-year-olds. I have heard the old story that soldiering builds character and while I admit that I have seen instances where I felt that that was true, on the whole, it is not true. For after all, what is the purpose of an army? Let us be realistic. The purpose of an army is to kill and destroy. All training is toward that goal. If the training is not toward that goal, the training is ineffective. Does that build a character that you want for 18-year-olds?

The 18-year-old boy that goes to the Army loses the proper influences during that formative period of his life in which his character is patterned and at the same time he is lost from useful civilian pursuits. He ceases to till the land, to run the lathes, to work the mines, to go to school. He ceases to produce and he ceases to grow intellectually and spiritually. That youth is the America of tomorrow.

While I realize that perhaps now we must be prepared to meet aggression, I also realize that you cannot stop thought by armies; communism is, in a way, a

thought. It is the philosophy of the hopeless. Communism is like a vulture; it preys upon a dead culture and economy, never a healthy, free, virile economy and culture. If America ever, by sword rattling and stifling normal production and living, wrecks its fine culture and standard of living, then communism won't have to move in—it will be here.

The pages of history are filled with nations that wreck themselves by turning their youth into parading soldiers instead of useful, productive citizens.

Let us not create a Frankenstein that will destroy us. Let us not draft the boys before they are 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRAY) there were—ayes 118, noes 154.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. BRAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 140, noes 179.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute, as amended.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 171, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHORT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 29, line 4, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for duty in Europe in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty unless the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its

approval of the assignment for such duty of persons so inducted."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit on the ground that it seeks to modify an amendment which has been adopted by the House, and therefore the motion is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it be in order at this time to move to amend the rule under which the measure is presently being considered?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. HALLECK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: If the previous question on the motion to recommit were to be voted down, would it then be in order to offer an amendment to a straight motion to recommit, which might be offered, to include a motion to recommit with instructions?

The SPEAKER. The Chair must say that the answer of the Chair to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will be an answer to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule, but if the gentleman desires to be heard, the Chair will hear him.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think the point of order is well taken. I know that when it comes to a straight amendment of a bill, when an amendment changing any part of a bill has been adopted and that amendment has been voted on in the House, then it is not in order to change that amendment by a motion to recommit. But where you take an entire bill—and that is the case here—and bring it to the floor of the House and pass it, it is just as much in order to amend it by a motion to recommit as it would be to amend it on the floor. I have a dozen rules in my hand similar to this one. I have been in this House a long time and I have been through about as many parliamentary battles as anybody else; and I submit that this motion is in order under the Rules of the House.

The point of order should be overruled.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may be heard on the matter.

Mr. HALLECK. After discussing the matter with our able Parliamentarian, whose judgment I respect, I am afraid that I must recognize that the point of order is probably well taken. However, I must again say that it is certainly—shall I say tragic?—that although apparently no such thing was intended, the minority has been by this resolution which we adopted, and which we incidentally helped to bring to quick action, shut off from what I have considered to be an inviolate right of the minority to offer a motion to recommit with instructions, when a measure in the nature of an original bill was being considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not in a position to be helpful to the gentleman from Indiana in the remarks he made.

The Chair knew this question would be raised and has looked into it.

The rule is well established that a motion to recommit may not include instructions to strike out any part of an amendment which has been agreed to by the House or to perfect an amendment which has been agreed to by the House—sections 2712 to 2725 of volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents.

In the present instance the House has just adopted an amendment which strikes out all of the bill after the enacting clause and inserts, by way of amendment, an entirely new text. Therefore, it seems to the Chair that any instruction embodied in a motion to recommit to change any of the text of the amendment which has been adopted or to strike out any part of it would not be in order. The net result is therefore that that the only motion to recommit now in order is a plain motion to recommit without instructions.

The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is still opposed to the bill, the Chair assumes?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I am still opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to recommit the bill S. 1 to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 121, nays 296, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—121

Abernethy	Chenoweth	Hull
Adair	Chipfield	Irving
Allen, Ill.	Church	Jenison
Andersen,	Clevenger	Jenkins
H. Carl	Colmer	Jensen
Andresen,	Crawford	Jonas
August H.	Crumpacker	Judd
Angell	Curtis, Mo.	Larcade
Arends	Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte
Ayres	Davis, Ga.	Lovre
Barden	Davi., Wis.	McCulloch
Beamer	Dolliver	McGregor
Bender	Dondero	McVey
Bennett, Mich.	Doughton	Mack, Wash.
Berry	Elston	Marshall
Betts	Fellows	Martin, Mass.
Bishop	George	Mason
Blatnik	Golden	Miller, Nebr.
Bolton	Gossett	Morris
Bow	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Hagen	Nelson
Bray	Halleck	Nicholson
Brehm	Hand	O'Hara
Brown, Ohio	Harden	Passman
Brownson	Harrison, Wyo.	Phillips
Buffett	Harvey	Phillips
Burdick	Hoeven	Powell
Busbey	Hoffman, Ill.	Rankin
Bush	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece, Tenn.
Butler	Horan	Reed, Ill.



Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
St. George  
Schwabe  
Scrivner  
Secrest  
Shafer  
Sheehan  
Short  
Simpson, Ill.  
Smith, Kans.  
Springer

Stefan  
Taber  
Tackett  
Talle  
Thompson,  
Mich.  
Vail  
Van Pelt  
Velde  
Vorys  
Vursell  
Weichel

Werdel  
Wheeler  
Whitten  
Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. Y.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Wood, Ga.

Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Stanley  
Steed  
Stigler  
Stockman  
Sutton  
Taylor  
Thomas  
Thompson, Tex.

Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Towe  
Trimble  
Van Zandt  
Vaughn  
Vinson  
Walter  
Welch  
Wharton  
Whitaker

Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wigglesworth  
Willis  
Wilson, Tex.  
Wolverton  
Yates  
Yorty  
Zablocki

Hagen  
Hale  
Hall  
Hall, Edwin Arthur  
Hall, Leonard W.  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Va.  
Harrison, Wyo.  
Harvey  
Havenner  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hébert  
Hedrick  
Heffernan  
Heller  
Herlong  
Herter  
Hesilton  
Hess  
Hill  
Hillings  
Hinshaw  
Hoeven  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Holfield  
Holmes  
Hope  
Horan  
Howell  
Hunter  
Irving  
Jackson, Calif.  
Jackson, Wash.  
James  
Jarman  
Javits  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones,  
Hamilton C.  
Jones,  
Woodrow W.  
Judd  
Karsten, Mo.  
Kearney  
Kearns  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Kennedy  
Keogh  
Kerr  
Kersten, Wis.  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
King  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Lane  
Lanham  
Lantaff  
Larcade  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lesinski  
Lind  
Lovre

Lucas  
Lyle  
McCarthy  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGrath  
McGregor  
McGuire  
McKinnon  
McMillan  
McMullen  
McVey  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magee  
Mahon  
Mansfield  
Martin, Iowa  
Martin, Mass.  
Meador  
Merron  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mills  
Mitchell  
Morano  
Morgan  
Morrison  
Morton  
Moulder  
Multer  
Mumma  
Murdock  
Murphy  
Murray, Tenn.  
Murray, Wis.  
Nelson  
Norblad  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Neill  
Ostertag  
O'Toole  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Patterson  
Perkins  
Phillips  
Pickett  
Poage  
Polk  
Potter  
Poulson  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Quinn  
Rabaut  
Radwan  
Rains  
Ramsay  
Reams  
Redden  
Reece, Tenn.  
Rees, Kans.  
Regan  
Rhodes  
Ribicoff  
Richards  
Richards

Riehlman  
Riley  
Roberts  
Robeson  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Sabath  
Sadlak  
St. George  
Sasser  
Saylor  
Schwabe  
Scott, Hardie  
Scott,  
Hugh D., Jr.  
Scrivner  
Scudder  
Secrest  
Seely-Brown  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sleminski  
Sikes  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Stanley  
Steed  
Stefan  
Stigler  
Stockman  
Sutton  
Taber  
Tackett  
Talle  
Taylor  
Thomas  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Towe  
Trimble  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Vaughn  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Vursell  
Walter  
Welch  
Wharton  
Wheeler  
Whitaker  
Whitten  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winstead  
Wolcott  
Wolverton  
Wood, Ga.  
Yates  
Yorty  
Zablocki

## NAYS—296

Aandahl  
Abbitt  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Allen, Calif.  
Anderson, Calif.  
Andrews  
Anfuso  
Aspinall  
Auchincloss  
Bailey  
Baker  
Bakewell  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bates, Ky.  
Bates, Mass.  
Battle  
Beall  
Beckworth  
Belcher  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bentsen  
Blackney  
Boggs, Del.  
Boggs, La.  
Bolling  
Bonner  
Bosone  
Boykin  
Breen  
Brooks  
Brown, Ga.  
Bryson  
Buckley  
Budge  
Burleson  
Burnside  
Burton  
Byrne, N. Y.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Camp  
Canfield  
Cannon  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Case  
Celler  
Chatham  
Chelf  
Chudoff  
Clemente  
Cole, Kans.  
Cole, N. Y.  
Combs  
Cooley  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Cotton  
Coudert  
Cox  
Cunningham  
Dague  
Dawson  
Deane  
DeGraffenried  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
Denny  
Denton  
Devereux  
D'Ewart  
Dingell  
Dollinger  
Donohue  
Donovan  
Dorn  
Doyle  
Durham  
Eaton  
Eberharter  
Ellsworth  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Feighan  
Fenton  
Fernandez  
Fine

Fisher  
Flood  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Ford  
Forrester  
Fugate  
Fulton  
Furcolo  
Gamble  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin  
Goodwin  
Gordon  
Gore  
Graham  
Granahan  
Granger  
Grant  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gregory  
Gwinn  
Hale  
Hall  
Edwin Arthur  
Hall, Leonard W.  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Va.  
Havenner  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hébert  
Hedrick  
Heffernan  
Heller  
Herlong  
Herter  
Hesilton  
Hess  
Hill  
Hillings  
Hinshaw  
Hollfield  
Holmes  
Hope  
Howell  
Hunter  
Hunt  
Jackson, Calif.  
Jackson, Wash.  
James  
Jarman  
Javits  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones,  
Hamilton C.  
Jones,  
Woodrow W.  
Karsten, Mo.  
Kearney  
Kearns  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Kennedy  
Keogh  
Kerr  
Kersten, Wis.  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
King  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Lane  
Lanham  
Lantaff  
Latham  
Lesinski  
Lind  
Lucas  
Lyle

McCarthy  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McDonough  
McGrath  
McGuire  
McKinnon  
McMillan  
McMullen  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Madden  
Magee  
Mahon  
Mansfield  
Martin, Iowa  
Martin, Mass.  
Meador  
Merron  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mills  
Mitchell  
Morano  
Morgan  
Morrison  
Morton  
Moulder  
Multer  
Mumma  
Murdock  
Murphy  
Murray, Tenn.  
Murray, Wis.  
Nelson  
Norblad  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Neill  
Ostertag  
O'Toole  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Patterson  
Perkins  
Phillips  
Pickett  
Poage  
Polk  
Potter  
Poulson  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Quinn  
Rabaut  
Radwan  
Rains  
Ramsay  
Reams  
Redden  
Reece, Tenn.  
Rees, Kans.  
Regan  
Rhodes  
Ribicoff  
Richards  
Richards  
Riley  
Roberts  
Robeson  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Sabath  
Sadlak  
Sasser  
Saylor  
Scott, Hardie  
Scott,  
Hugh D., Jr.  
Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sleminski  
Sikes  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Miss.

Allen, La.  
Armstrong  
Buchanan  
Cresser  
Davis, Tenn.  
Frazier

Gillette  
Hart  
O'Konski  
Rivers  
Sittler  
Smith, Wis.

Teague  
Wier  
Wood, Idaho  
Woodruff

## NOT VOTING—16

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Sittler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Frazier against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hart with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays, 44, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

## YEAS—372

Aandahl  
Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Allen, Calif.  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Anderson, Calif.  
Andresen,  
August H.  
Andrews  
Anfuso  
Angell  
Arend  
Aspinall  
Auchincloss  
Ayres  
Bailey  
Baker  
Bakewell  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bates, Ky.  
Bates, Mass.  
Battle  
Beall  
Beckworth  
Belcher  
Bender  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bennett, Mich.  
Bentsen  
Berry  
Betts  
Blackney  
Blatnik  
Boggs, Del.  
Boggs, La.  
Bolling  
Bolton  
Bonner  
Bosone  
Boykin  
Bramblett  
Bray  
Breen  
Brehm  
Brooks

Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Ohio  
Bryson  
Buckley  
Budge  
Burdick  
Burleson  
Burnside  
Burton  
Bush  
Byrne, N. Y.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Camp  
Canfield  
Cannon  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Case  
Celler  
Chelf  
Chenoweth  
Chudoff  
Church  
Clemente  
Cole, Kans.  
Cole, N. Y.  
Colmer  
Combs  
Cooley  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Cotton  
Coudert  
Cox  
Crawford  
Cunningham  
Curtis, Nebr.  
Dague  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
Dawson  
Deane  
DeGraffenried  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
Denny  
Denton  
Devereux  
D'Ewart

Dingell  
Dollinger  
Dolliver  
Dondero  
Donohue  
Donovan  
Dorn  
Doyle  
Durham  
Eaton  
Eberharter  
Elliott  
Ellsworth  
Elston  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Feighan  
Fellows  
Fenton  
Fernandez  
Fine  
Fisher  
Flood  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Ford  
Forrester  
Fugate  
Fulton  
Furcolo  
Gamble  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin  
George  
Goodwin  
Gordon  
Gore  
Gossett  
Graham  
Granahan  
Granger  
Grant  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gregory  
Gwinn

Hagen  
Hale  
Hall  
Hall, Edwin Arthur  
Hall, Leonard W.  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Va.  
Harrison, Wyo.  
Harvey  
Havenner  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hébert  
Hedrick  
Heffernan  
Heller  
Herlong  
Herter  
Hesilton  
Hess  
Hill  
Hillings  
Hinshaw  
Hoeven  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Holfield  
Holmes  
Hope  
Horan  
Howell  
Hunter  
Irving  
Jackson, Calif.  
Jackson, Wash.  
James  
Jarman  
Javits  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones,  
Hamilton C.  
Jones,  
Woodrow W.  
Judd  
Karsten, Mo.  
Kearney  
Kearns  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Kennedy  
Keogh  
Kerr  
Kersten, Wis.  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
King  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Lane  
Lanham  
Lantaff  
Larcade  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lesinski  
Lind  
Lovre

Lucas  
Lyle  
McCarthy  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGrath  
McGregor  
McGuire  
McKinnon  
McMillan  
McMullen  
McVey  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magee  
Mahon  
Mansfield  
Martin, Iowa  
Martin, Mass.  
Meador  
Merron  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mills  
Mitchell  
Morano  
Morgan  
Morrison  
Morton  
Moulder  
Multer  
Mumma  
Murdock  
Murphy  
Murray, Tenn.  
Murray, Wis.  
Nelson  
Norblad  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Neill  
Ostertag  
O'Toole  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Patterson  
Perkins  
Phillips  
Pickett  
Poage  
Polk  
Potter  
Poulson  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Quinn  
Rabaut  
Radwan  
Rains  
Ramsay  
Reams  
Redden  
Reece, Tenn.  
Rees, Kans.  
Regan  
Rhodes  
Ribicoff  
Richards  
Richards

Riehlman  
Riley  
Roberts  
Robeson  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Sabath  
Sadlak  
St. George  
Sasser  
Saylor  
Schwabe  
Scott, Hardie  
Scott,  
Hugh D., Jr.  
Scrivner  
Scudder  
Secrest  
Seely-Brown  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sleminski  
Sikes  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Stanley  
Steed  
Stefan  
Stigler  
Stockman  
Sutton  
Taber  
Tackett  
Talle  
Taylor  
Thomas  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Towe  
Trimble  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Vaughn  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Vursell  
Walter  
Welch  
Wharton  
Wheeler  
Whitaker  
Whitten  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winstead  
Wolcott  
Wolverton  
Wood, Ga.  
Yates  
Yorty  
Zablocki

## NAYS—44

Adair  
Allen, Ill.  
Barden  
Beamer  
Bishop  
Bow  
Brownson  
Buffett  
Busbey  
Butler  
Chipperfield  
Clevenger  
Crumpacker  
Curtis, Mo.  
Doughton

Golden  
Gross  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Hull  
Jenison  
Jenkins  
Jonas  
Marshall  
Mason  
Morris  
Nicholson  
O'Hara  
Phillips  
Powell  
Rankin

Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Shafer  
Sheehan  
Short  
Simpson, Ill.  
Smith, Kans.  
Thompson,  
Mich.  
Vail  
Velde  
Werdel  
Williams, N. Y.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Withrow

## NOT VOTING—17

Allen, La.  
Armstrong  
Buchanan  
Chatham  
Cresser  
Davis, Tenn.

Frazier  
Gillette  
Hart  
O'Konski  
Rivers  
Sittler

Smith, Wis.  
Teague  
Wier  
Wood, Idaho  
Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sittler for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hart with Mr. Gillette.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment to the bill S. 1 and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, KILDAY, DURHAM, SHORT, ARENDS, and COLE of New York.

#### GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes."

#### CORRECTION OF SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to correct the numbers and subnumbers of the sections of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar, which under the rules it would be in order to call on Monday next, be in order on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no legislative business for Monday.

On Tuesday the Consent Calendar will be called, and there will be four suspensions, unless some of the bills are passed on the Consent Calendar. One is the bill S. 82, relating to burial benefits for Philippine veterans, another is the bill H. R. 318, which amends the Veterans' Act of 1924, the third is the bill H. R. 316, relating to a minimum pension for veterans with arrested tuberculosis, and the fourth is House Joint Resolution 197, to extend the Export Control Act of 1949.

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday, and there will also be the exercises celebrating Pan-American Day.

Following that there will be general debate on the bill H. R. 3709, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill of 1952.

Tuesday is primary day in New Jersey, and in accordance with the proper and fixed custom out of respect to the Members from any State having an election due to the necessity of their being in their States on those days, an agreement has been made that if there are any roll calls on Tuesday, with the permission of the House, which has never been denied, they will be postponed to Wednesday next.

The Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

The program as to Thursday and Friday is undetermined at the present time, and if there is anything for those days, I will announce it to the House just as soon as possible.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, is there any news that the gentleman has for us regarding the reported visit of General MacArthur on Thursday or Friday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is in a most difficult position to answer that inquiry; but from information received, feels that it will be satisfactorily solved.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I will not press the matter any further.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, conference reports, if any, may be brought up at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I intended to ask that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with, but I promised the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that I would not make the request in his absence. I note that the gentleman is not in the Chamber, and in keeping with my promise to him I will make the request some other time.

#### UNITED STATES v. EDWARD A. RUMELY

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 17, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Edward A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. EDWARD A. RUMELY, No. 1789-50

The PRESIDENT of the UNITED STATES TO HON. HENDERSON LANHAM:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 13th day of April A. D. 1951.

HARRY M. HULL,

Clerk.

By PAUL A. ROSEN,

Deputy Clerk.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 17, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Edward A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.



The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES V. EDWARD A. RUMELY, No. 1789-50

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO HON. CLYDE DOYLE:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 13th day of April A. D. 1951.

HARRY M. HULL,  
Clerk.

By W. MILESTEAD,  
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 17, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Edward A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES V. EDWARD A. RUMELY, No. 1789-50

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO HON. CARL ALBERT:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 13th day of April A. D. 1951.

HARRY M. HULL,  
Clerk.

By W. MILESTEAD,  
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 194) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representatives CARL ALBERT, HENDERSON LANHAM, and CLYDE DOYLE, Members of this House, have been served with subpoenas to appear as witnesses before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m., on the 17th day of April 1951, in the case of the United States v. Edward A. Rumely, Criminal Docket No. 1789-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore, be it Resolved, That Representatives CARL ALBERT, HENDERSON LANHAM, and CLYDE DOYLE are authorized to appear in response to the subpoenas of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States v. Edward A. Rumely at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

Mr. KERSTEN of WISCONSIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing for a constitutional amendment whereby the Congress by a two-thirds vote may declare it no longer has confidence in the manner in which the President is performing the functions of his office and thereby bring about a general national election within 10 days thereafter.

America faces one of the most serious crises in its history due to the mediocre and irresponsible leadership of the past 6 years. We cannot wait until the elections of November 1952. Time is running out. In the hands of Svengali-like advisers Truman has permitted the Reds to take over nearly half of the world.

His recent removal of General MacArthur, our most effective military leader in the life and death struggle with Communism can be characterized as one of the President's most irresponsible acts.

DUTY TO VOTE AND EXPRESS TO CONGRESS WILL OF MAJORITY OF PEOPLE OF ELEVENTH ILLINOIS DISTRICT ON PENDING COMBINATION UMT AND DRAFT

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, based on the will of my people, I am forced to vote against bill S. 1, for the following reasons:

First. The vast majority in my district is opposed to drafting 18- and 18½-year-old boys.

Second. The majority in my district is against UMT at this time and feels that this issue should be decided at the proper time and place.

Third. The vast majority of my constituents is against President Truman's usurpation of congressional power in sending troops overseas without the consent of Congress. Passing this bill will give more troops and implied consent for the President to send troops wherever he pleases.

Fourth. I am fearful that when this House bill goes to conference to iron out the differences between it and the Senate version, we might get a distinct shock by having a compromise bill which only comprises the House.

For the above reasons, the only way I could, in clear conscience, oppose the will of the majority of my people would be on the basis that I knew of the facts or circumstances which were not known to my people, or that, by following the will of my constituents, I would be voting against the greater good of the country as a whole. In that event, it would be incumbent upon me to go back to my people and explain to them the circumstances and conditions which I know, and of which they had no knowledge. But, in the present case, I must confess that I do not have any inside information or any untold facts that have not been available to my constituents.

Therefore, I must vote against the present draft and universal military training bill.

#### EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use a minute but only such time as is necessary to explain my "no" vote on the final passage of the bill under consideration today. My "no" vote, I hope, will be interpreted as a vote of no confidence.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$205.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a telegram from the Brooklyn Eagle and his answer thereto.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two telegrams.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain correspondence in regard to Mr. Fred Searle's services with the War Mobilization Board.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and in-

clude a statement recently made by Pope Pius XII.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from the debate of January 24 regarding the Servicemen's Indemnity Act.

Mr. BREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Dayton Daily News.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Parkersburg Sentinel.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a column of comment by Mr. Baldwin in the New York Times.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. BRAY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today on the bill S. 1 and include therein an article from the Washington Post.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BROWNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three letters dealing with the effects of the present training program on untimely casualties in Korea.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include articles.

Mr. BUSBEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to ex-

tend his remarks and include certain communications addressed to him.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a communication.

Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain communications addressed to him.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Wood of Idaho, from April 13 to 19, on account of official business.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the printing of the annual reports of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as separate House documents.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.;

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces; and

H. R. 3040. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Ogden, Utah, to the Ogden Chamber of Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

380. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

381. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Com-

missioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

382. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

383. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of John Liu, alias Yoh-Han Liu, file No. A-3377965 CR 27129, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3709. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3401. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; without amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1149. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3709. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3710. A bill to authorize the Director of the Bureau of the Census to furnish certain information; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3711. A bill relating to the temporary free importation of samples under bond for exportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3712. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations requiring that freight cars be so equipped or painted that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCGUIRE:

H. R. 3713. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as



amended, with respect to eligibility for retirement in case of involuntary separation from the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 3714. A bill to reduce the annual leave and sick leave of Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3715. A bill to amend the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, by adding thereto a new subsection 457 (c); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3716. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands in Pueblo County, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 3717. A bill to provide for the termination of the powers and succession of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3718. A bill to provide for the payment of fair compensation to producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals for use in the prosecution of World War II; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3719. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3720. A bill to exempt certain accredited representatives of recognized veterans' organizations from the provisions of 18 United States Code 284 (a) for the purpose of prosecuting claims before the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for filling the office of President after a vote of no confidence by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 21, 1951, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for filling the office of President after a vote of no confidence by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRVING:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States every 4 years according to their respective numbers of persons who voted in the last Presidential election before such apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power to levy taxes and appropriate the revenue therefrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting Congress

to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Salomon Nadler, Vera Nadler, Daniel Nadler, and Robert Nadler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Joe Penovich, Gino Yurman, Lorenzo Laconi, Frank Zgagliardich, and Ante Keznic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYZIN:

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of William C. Minard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Madge Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ying Tak Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3727. A bill for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 3728. A bill for the relief of Seraphina Neffs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Oliver E. Hambleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3730. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3731. A bill for the relief of Megumi Takagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3732. A bill for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

233. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Letter from Michael J. Rita, president, Rita Sales Corp., 4025 Fourth Avenue, Moline, Ill., in opposition to proposed excise tax increase on trailer coaches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

224. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution entitled "Resolution memorializing Congress to oppose the proposed doubling of the present Federal gasoline taxes from 1½ cents to 3 cents per gallon, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session and approved by the Acting Governor on April 6, 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the supreme Counselor of the minds of men and the companion of their hearts, we pray that all who hold positions of trust and leadership in the affairs of government may walk humbly with the Lord.

May they be men and women of lofty ideals and principles and enable them to legislate wisely and cooperatively for the common good and welfare of all mankind.

Grant that they may act worthily in every duty and be guided by Thy spirit in council and decision as they share in the grave responsibility of leading our Nation in the path of righteousness and justice during these days of trial and tribulation.

May the citizens of our Republic prize more highly the privileges of self-government and the blessings of being a free people. Make us more truly grateful and worthy of the tremendous sacrifices that are being made by our fellow citizens in the armed services of our country who are defending our liberties.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 13, 1951, was read and approved.

#### SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE RECESS ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday next for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur in joint meeting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 195.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate be requested to return to the House the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and that the Clerk be authorized to reengross the said bill with the following correction:

Page 11, line 11, strike out "\$18,350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$19,100,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is because the enrolling clerk made a mistake in indicating that the Heselton amendment was carried instead of being defeated on roll call; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. The engrossed copy showed the earlier action but failed to change back on final roll call.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we on the Republican side of the subcommittee have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.